City Council
Mayor Patrick Slayter
Vice Mayor Neysa Hinton
Una Glass
Sarah Glade Gurney
Diana Rich

City of Sebastopol

City Manager
Larry McLaughlin
lmclaughlin@Cityofsebastopol.org
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk, MMC
Mary Gourley
mgourley@Cityofsebastopol.org

CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
`MINUTES FOR Meeting of April 19, 2022

As Approved by the City Council at their regular meeting of May 3, 2022

The City Council Regular meeting will be held via teleconference pursuant to AB 361. Pursuant to AB 361 (2021), Teleconference Restrictions of the Brown Act Have Been Suspended, as Well as the Requirement to Provide a Physical Location for Members of the Public to Participate in the Meeting. The City of Sebastopol City Council meeting will not be physically open to the public and all City Council Members will be teleconferencing into the meeting via Zoom.

Please note that minutes are not meant to be verbatim minutes and are meant to be the City's record of Actions Taken (Approved Motion of Agenda Item(s)).

6:00 pm Convene City Council Meeting - Meeting Start Time (ZOOM VIRTUAL FORMAT)

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Slayter called the regular meeting to order at 6:01pm.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Mayor Patrick Slayter – By video teleconference
Vice Mayor Neysa Hinton – By video teleconference
Councilmember Una Glass – By video teleconference
Councilmember Sarah Gurney – By video teleconference
Councilmember Diana Gardner Rich - By video teleconference

Absent: None

Staff: City Manager/City Attorney Larry McLaughlin
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk Mary Gourley
Administrative Services Director Ana Kwong
Engineering Consultant Toni Bertolero, GHD
City Engineer Mario Landeros, GHD
Fire Chief Bill Braga
Planning Director Kari Svanstrom
Police Chief Kevin Kilgore
Public Works Superintendent Dante Del Prete

SALUTE TO THE FLAG: Mayor Slayter led the Salute to the Flag.

COUNCIL PROTOCOLS FOR MEETING:
City staff read the protocols for the meeting.

- This meeting is being conducted utilizing virtual settings for teleconferencing and electronic means consistent with State of California Executive Orders regarding the COVID 19 pandemic and AB 361.

- Live stream and zoom are being utilized for this meeting. In case of technical issues, meetings will be uploaded to the City web site as soon as possible after this meeting.
- Members of the public may view and listen to the meeting by use of Zoom and Live Stream as noted on the City's website and as noted on the agenda.
- Members of the public wishing to speak to the City Council may do so during public comment or may comment on agenda items during the discussion of each item and must be logged into Zoom. Live Stream is a viewing only format.
- Anyone using abusive, vulgar, offensive, threatening, or harassing language, personal attacks of any kind or offensive terms that target specific individuals or groups will be muted and removed from the meeting.

PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS: NONE

PLEASE NOTE:

- Public Comment on all items listed on the agenda will be limited to two minutes, per person, per item.
- The Public Comment Portion of the Agenda will allow for 20 minutes at the beginning of the meeting and public comment not heard during those 20 minutes will continue at the end of the agenda, following the last calendared item and before Reports.

Council welcomes and encourages additional comments via email. Public Comment Emails can be sent to: CityCouncil@Cityofsebastopol.org

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA :

During General Public Comment, the public is invited to make comments on items of public interest that are within the City Council's subject matter jurisdiction and that are not listed on the current agenda.
Speakers are allowed to speak for a maximum of three minutes so that all speakers have an opportunity to address the City Council.
Power point or visual presentations for public comment shall not be permitted unless approved by the Agenda Review Committee two weeks prior to the requested meeting date.
Speakers may not "yield" a portion of their allotted time to others.
The Mayor has the authority to limit or extend the time allowed for speakers dependent on the number of speakers in attendance.
The Mayor can poll the members of the public for an indication of the number of people wishing to speak, then call on individuals to speak.
It is the goal of the Council to conclude the public comments portion of the agenda within 20 minutes. If the public comment period exceeds twenty minutes, the presiding officer, typically the Mayor, reserves the right to reduce the time per speaker or carry over public comments to after all business items are completed.
The City Clerk will monitor the time for public comments and inform the speakers when the time limitation has been reached.
The Mayor could survey the members of the public, as appropriate, to move agenda items up or back to address the members of the public items of concern.
Public participation is encouraged on all public agenda items.
Council and staff will treat participants and each other with courtesy. Derogatory or sarcastic comments are inappropriate.
The public will likewise be encouraged by the Mayor to maintain meeting decorum.
In Council meetings when citizens are agitated, the Mayor may call a short recess to calm the situation.
If a member of the public is unable to attend the Council meeting, written communications may be sent to the City Clerk by e-mail or by regular mail. Communications received after distribution of the agenda packet will be made available to the Council at/or as soon after the meeting.

Dorothy Schwartzberg commented as follows:

- My name is Dorothy Schwartzberg and I'm living in Sebastopol. I'm a senior.
- In the case of the water meters and 5G attachments, these things cause some serious suffering for certain people. People who have electromagnetic injury and sensitivity.
- This is something that is well known in Europe and acted upon there.
- It affects everyone whether you're aware of it or not and it affects the young who are growing and developing and the elder whether or not they are weakened.

- My request is about letting go of what's right, what you heard and what who you may be believing.
- There are people who are suffering and your mercy is something that can alleviate this suffering.
- Please, pay attention to this problem and look it over.
- Make sure that you are doing best for the people who are suffering from this in Sebastopol.

Jann commented as follows:

- I just want to introduce the Caltrans sustainable transportation planning grant.
- It is exactly what it sounds like. Caltrans has a grant. It's coming up in October.
- A good little chunk of our business district downtown core met last week and listened to Paul Fritz who went in great detail presenting the possibilities and the infusion that this grant would do into our town.
- It is a planning grant.
- However, the City needs to take this on. I hope you will. We can't let this go. It cannot go by one more year.
- It's going to take a while to plan and execute.
- Please, entertain hiring a grant writer specific for this project and thank you very much.

Sally commented as follows:

- I wanted to support what Jann just introduced.
- As a ten-year business owner and a resident in the community, we survived flood, fire, now COVID and instead of surviving, I would like to see us all thrive.
- I'd like us to create an environment where we can all thrive to create community where we all come together
- I support and encourage the City Council to hire a grant writer and to apply for the Caltrans sustainable planning grant.

Bart commented as follows:

- We had the honor of meeting with Paul Fritz last week in an event that Jann had planned.
- I support the Caltrans sustainable transportation grant.
- This City needs help.
- The business district has turned into a highway.
- This Caltrans grant was made for the City.
- Other cities have utilized it and made changes to their cities and downtown areas.
- It's time to make Sebastopol an attractive place for visitors to come to not just to drive through and not just for trucking to drive through.
- I'm asking the City Council to take a serious look at this and see what could be done to get a grant writer to write a proposal for this City and for the City's future.
- I know that the Council works very hard on issues at hand today that the City has to deal with.
- The future of the City has to be planned.
- There has to be planning and if you look at the City, a downtown district was never really planned.
- It always was a pass through or thoroughfare.
- It's time as the dynamic of businesses changing to attract businesses that want to come here and do business and invest money into this town and Caltrans is the people that we need to be speaking to make something happen.
- I ask you, it's been years. We've been here for ten years and we have not seen any major changes to the downtown district other than the flags that have gone up.
- There needs to be some group to drive a plan to make substantial changes.

Lauri commented as follows:

- I own a home and two businesses in Sebastopol.
- We would really, with my partner Alex, we would really like to see the downtown be more attractive to tourists and locals and more pedestrian friendly.
- We support what the other speakers have mentioned.
- This Caltrans sustainable planning grant and have the City fund a grant writer to guarantee those funds and really start to plan the future of downtown Sebastopol.

Paul Fritz commented as follows:

- We have been discussing improvements for downtown for years.
- It's time to take some action.
- Main Street has been designed to move as many cars as possible as quickly as possible through town.
- This is not a great environment for people.
- In the highway to transportation concept report, Caltrans had this to say, one way streets and traffic diversion design to make downtown more of place to drive through rather than the walk or bike.
- The one way street create the need to travel out of direction and vehicle speeds present a barrier to bicycle use.
- It's an issue for pedestrians using the downtown area because of high vehicle speeds and limited pedestrian crossing opportunities.
- Caltrans understands the need for Main Street to be better to accommodate pedestrians and create a place people want to spend time to improve our community as well as our commerce.
- We have a perfect case study in Sebastopol.
- People like the bar low because there's space for them and vehicle speed is low.
- There's plenty of examples of small town Main Streets.
- It happens every year to do this October.
- The time is now to get on top of this.
- I urge the City to seriously consider this and make plan to apply for this grant this year.
- To do exactly this kind of plan to improve the pedestrian environment of their downtown and to spur public and private investment.
- It's high time we take action to improve our Main Street.

Arthur George commented as follows:

- I'd like to make a quick word in support and gratitude to our Police Chief.
- I have not always been in agreement with the Chief's positions and even tonight on a separate agenda item fine tuning parking regulation, I have submitted critical but hopefully constructive comment.
- Over the past many months as we have moved through clearances of the Laguna and Morris Street, the Chief has been remarkably steady with his patience and outreach.
- Events in other cities that became confrontational flash points, even violent, have not gone that way here.
- Credit must be given to the Chief's willingness to work collaboratively and gain the trust of area stakeholders, volunteers and unhoused persons to engage collaboratively with him.
- Even when vehicles have been removed by towing, it's been after months of ample advisement, counseling, relocation efforts and warnings before enforcement action.
- There's not been a big fist approach which has led to conflict elsewhere and Chief Kilgore had a calming effect on these proceedings as others grew impatient on one hand or perhaps defiant on another.
- The Chief has made himself available for zoom meetings.

- He's consistently taken time to do that.
- He has said when he acts, it's within a reasonable manner and respect for others.
- I thought the Council might like to hear that recognition from the ground level.

Kyle commented as follows:

- In July of last year, this Council met to discuss Palm Avenue being converted into a one way street.
- I spoke about the need for infrastructure such as the sidewalk gap that is are occurring in that area.
- This Council rather than discussing the sidewalk gaps spoke to the need of parking spaces that could be included on that one way.
- Here we are many, many months later. Palm Avenue in that section is not a one way street.
- Palm Avenue has not been brought back to this Council for full discussion as to what the actual plans are.
- Perhaps this has something to do with the fact we no longer have an Engineering Manager and we subcontract that work out to an engineer who does things on a case by case basis.
- Please, Council, update the public on the status of Palm Avenue and a timeline for completion that we might see.

Linda Berg commented as follows:

- I would like to acknowledge the great job that Chief is doing and thank him for it.
- By the way, you're in my prayers every night. Thank you again.
- That said, I am saddened by the position that this City Council has taken on the wireless water meters and pretty much without recognizing the harm and danger of cooking ourselves by adding more radiation every 30 feet or so.
- I hope you business owners are with me, they are in the process of putting in radiation in the water meters under the sidewalk, in front of your businesses and your homes.
- Over 3,000 of them at a cost of $2.2 million which is waste of money.
- It is a move toward making more preventable illnesses as in cancer and also EMF.
- It's just the wrong thing to do.
- That's where you need to speak up now if you want to attract more people to your businesses and to this town.
- We would surpass the Council had a reputation for using good sense in what came to a wireless radiation and we were ground zero for opposition and smart meters.
- I am urging all you people that business owners that want to make this town happy and healthy and attractive to everybody to take a stand and let the City Council know you do not want the wireless meters put on sidewalk replacing the other safer, cheaper, more reliable mechanical meters

Rick commented as follows:

- I want to open by thanks the City Council for your incredible hard work.
- Sometime ago I said that Sebastopol was a kind City.
- I am so impressed with the kindnesses that are being shown all the time especially to people who aren't as fortunate as most people.
- I am noticing very cleverly disguised places where people are sleeping.
- In my neighborhood there's been reporting of people lurking in the woods.
- I think that's happening because there's I don't know how many people in the encampment and approved encampment.
- I am wondering if anybody might be interested in contacting Linda Hopkins to try to amend the legislations that were made to curb the hippies back in the 70s and make it possible for people where land to have one or two tents or one or two RVs.

- There was a couple who presented a couple of months ago and they talked about being homeless and having somebody take them in and what a great effect that had on them and thank you all for your hard work.

Mayor Slayter responded to public comment as follows:

- I would suggest that any resident of West County who is interested in the activities of the supervisor to contact that office directly.
- Leo Chyi is Supervisor Hopkins district director and he can help guide messages and get things in front of the supervisor. Honestly, probably faster than any of us electeds would be able to.
- Go straight to the source rather than try to leapfrog it through this Council which doesn't have jurisdiction out there.
- That's my suggestion there. I'm not saying that I won't mention this to Supervisor Hopkins but I'm also saying advocacy on the citizens part is equally important.
- We had a question about engineering services in the City and those are being provided by a contract engineer who is our City Engineer.
- The fact that that individual is not a City employee has no bearing at all on the services that they provide for the City.
- That's how our engineering management services and City Engineer position is handled right now.
- Related to that was the Palm Avenue revision to the roadway and traffic direction I will ask GHD to give an update

Toni Bertolero, GHD, commented as follows:

- I would like to provide that update and the last time Council spoke about this, there was direction to include the sidewalk on the North side of Palm Avenue to turn it into one way street and do some roadway repairs.
- When all that was added to the project it rose to the level of being capital improvement project because it was over $100,000.
- The project, it was not in the current budget and it's being added for consideration by Council to the fiscal year '22-'23 capital program budget.
- You'll see it when that budget is being discussed.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Those internal discussions with the budget committee are under way now.
- As a Council have the budget presented to us in late May and we try to get it adopted by mid-June.
- We're not very far away from that.
- Then the other question or comments were about potential for the Caltrans planning grant.
- Does Engineering have any information about that to share?

Toni Bertolero, GHD, responded to public comment as follows:

- We have been in discussion regarding this planning grant since it came out last November.
- Steve Weinberger who is the Traffic Engineering Consultant has quite a bit of knowledge about the downtown area and involved with many of the past studies that occurred in that area.
- He's on sabbatical right now. He will be back in June.
- We decided that when he returns from sabbatical in June, we'll discuss almost elements for this planning grant that's due in October or November.
- The we'll probably be bringing this item back to Council in the July, August time frame to discuss what kind of a grant we could apply for.

STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: Conflicts of interest may arise in situations where a public official deliberating towards a decision, has an actual or potential financial interest in the matter before the Council. In accordance with state law, an actual conflict of interest is one that would be to the private financial benefit of a public official, a relative or a business with which the Councilmember is associated. A potential conflict of interest is one that could be to the private financial benefit of a Councilmember, a relative or a business with which the Councilmember is associated. A Councilmember must publicly announce potential and actual conflicts of interest, and, in the case of actual conflict of interest, must refrain from participating in debate on the issue or from voting on the issue and must remove themselves from the dais.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I will note it's not necessarily a conflict with the item as agendized.
- The objective design standards and the conditions of approval is an item intended to be used for all projects, not specific projects and I have had communication with a couple of folks in the community about a project that is over on Bodega Avenue.
- There's two Councilmember who have a proximity conflict of interest and those two people are myself and the Vice Mayor and I will just warn everybody that if this conversation somehow and I don't think it should be because it's not the topic of the item but should it veer in that direction we will most likely recuse ourselves for whatever portion of that discussion is needed or is asked for.

CONSENT CALENDAR: The consent agenda consists of items that are routine in nature and do not require additional discussion by the City Council or have been reviewed by the City Council previously. These items may be approved by one motion without discussion unless a member of the City Council requests that the item be taken off the consent calendar.
The Mayor will read the consent calendar items; ask if a Councilmember wishes to remove one or more items from the consent calendar; and then open public comment to the members of the public in attendance. At this time, a member of the public may speak for up to three minutes on the entire consent calendar and request at that time that an agenda item or items be removed for discussion.
If an item or items are removed from the consent calendar, the item shall be placed at the end of the regular agenda items unless otherwise determined by the Mayor or Mayor Pro Tern.
Councilmembers may comment on Consent Calendar items or ask for minor clarifications without the need for pulling the item for separate consideration. Items requiring deliberation should be pulled for separate consideration and shall be placed at the end of the regular agenda items unless otherwise determined by the Mayor or Mayor Pro Tem.

Mayor Slayter read the consent calendar.
Mayor Slayter opened for public comment on the consent calendar.

Kyle Falbo commented as follows:

- We have an item regarding the minutes for the City Council special meeting of April 6th.
- It is apparent from the minutes that the agenda item was to conference with labor negotiators particularly service employee's international union.
- That's the extent of this meeting.
- I understand that they were negotiations are often shrouded in secrecy and it's unfortunate that's the case.
- These are of public interest.
- These are public funds and having these negotiations shrouded in secrecy makes it difficult for understanding what the budget will be in the future.
- The City has been in the red for four years straight.
- This is pre-pandemic that our City has been in the red.
- Unfortunately, when we have shrouded in secrecy without any report out, just the simplest amount of reporting out in terms of topic of negotiation, it's really difficult to know where we're going in future.

Mayor Slayter asked if any Councilmember wanted to remove a consent calendar item. There was no request to remove any item from the consent calendar. There were no requests.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin responded to public comment as follows:

- The negotiations are governed by a California state law that provide the discussions can be held in a confidential manner and discussed with the City Council in closed session.
- That's the request, generally speaking, of all labor groups that negotiation with cities.
- They want kept confidential negotiations as does the City to not impact those negotiations until they are complete.
- Once negotiations are complete, then the approval of those labor negotiations and discussion of saying will take place in a full open session on a regular City Council meeting.

Mayor Slayter called for a motion.

MOTION:
Councilmember Gurney moved and Councilmember Glass seconded the motion to approve Consent Calendar Item(s) Number(s) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

Mayor Slayter called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.
VOTE:

Ayes:	Councilmembers Glass, Gurney, Rich, Vice Mayor Hinton and Mayor Slayter
Noes:	None
Absent:	None
Abstain:	None

1. Approval of the April 5, 2022 City Council Meeting Minutes (Responsible Department: City Administration)

City Council Action: Approved April 5, 2022 City Council Meeting Minutes
Minute Order Number: 2022-129

2. Approval of the April 6, 2022 City Council Meeting Minutes – Special Meeting – Closed Session (Responsible Department: City Administration)

City Council Action: Approved April 6, 2022 City Council Meeting Minutes – Special Meeting – Closed Session
Minute Order Number: 2022-130

3. Extension of Emergency Proclamation of Local Emergency (COVID-19) issued by the Director of Emergency Services (Fire Chief)

City Council Action: Approved Extension of Emergency Proclamation of Local Emergency (COVID-19) issued by the Director of Emergency Services
Minute Order Number: 2022-131
Resolution Number: 6420-2022

4. Approval of Second Reading, Waiving of Further Reading and Adoption of Ordinance – Revisions to the Zoning Ordinance to prohibit new Gas Stations in Sebastopol (Responsible Department: Planning)

City Council Action: Approved Second Reading, Waiving of Further Reading and Adoption of Ordinance – Revisions to the Zoning Ordinance to prohibit new Gas Stations in Sebastopol
Minute Order Number: 2022-132
Ordinance Number: 1140

5. Accept bids and award construction contract for the First Street Water Main Replacement Project and adoption of Resolution for CIP budget amendment (Responsible Department: City Engineer)

City Council Action: Approved Acceptance of bids and award construction contract for the First Street Water Main Replacement Project and adoption of Resolution for CIP budget amendment
Minute Order Number: 2022-133

Resolution Number: 6421-2022

6. Approval of Funding Agreement for FY 2020-21 CDBG funds for the Youth Annex ADA Upgrades (Engineering/GHD)

City Council Action: Approved Funding Agreement for FY 2020-21 CDBG funds for the Youth Annex ADA Upgrades
Minute Order Number: 2022-134

7. Approval of Master Consultant Agreement for 4Leaf (Responsible Department: Planning)

City Council Action: Approved Master Consultant Agreement for 4Leaf
Minute Order Number: 2011-135

8. A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Sebastopol Rescinding Resolution No. 6393-2021 which Authorized the Issuance of One or More Series of Pension Obligation Bonds to Refinance Outstanding Obligations of the City to the California Public Employees' Retirement System, and Related Matters (Responsible Department: Administrative Services)

City Council Action: Approved Resolution of the City Council of the City of Sebastopol Rescinding Resolution No. 6393-2021 which Authorized the Issuance of One or More Series of Pension Obligation Bonds to Refinance Outstanding Obligations of the City to the California Public Employees' Retirement System, and Related Matters
Minute Order Number: 2022-136
Resolution Number: 6422-2022

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS/PRESENTATIONS: *(Please Note: Although informational/presentations items are routinely informational in nature, some informational items may contain request for actions such as support, direction to staff, follow up, or receipt of item based on the presentation/information provided.)*

9. Informational Presentation: Ives Pool (Ricardo Freitas/Virginia Anderegg)

Mayor Slayter introduced the agenda item and Ricardo Freitas and Virginia Anderegg.
Ricardo Freitas and Virginia Anderegg provided an informational presentation to the City Council.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment. There was none.

The Council thanked the presenters for the presentation.
City Council Action: None Taken. Informational Item Only.
Reference Order Number: 2022-137

10. Presentation from Relaunch Sebastopol Consultant and Consideration of Proposals for Branding – (Relaunch Sebastopol Consultant - Townie Media/Ad Hoc Committee/City Administration)

Mayor Slayter introduced the agenda item and introduced Laura Hagar and Colleen Martell.

Laura Hagar and Colleen Martell provided an informational presentation to the City Council.

Mayor Slayter opened for questions.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I just quickly thank you so much for that presentation.
- I know you mentioned the Website. Are you, at this point, anticipating adding event listings on any of those websites?

Relaunch Sebastopol Consultant commented yes.

Councilmember Rich commented do you think you might accommodate volunteer listings also?

Relaunch Sebastopol Consultant commented as follows:

- Absolutely.
- I've already reworked Townsie.
- We have moved volunteering to the front page of that.
- It was hiding down under community. Now it's on the front page.
- In organization in Sebastopol someone can click on that button and if they need volunteer they can just sign up right there.
- I'm looking forward to getting a calendar going. The City has really needed one for a long time. That's definitely on our list.
- That will be on both the visitor site and then more extensively on Townsie.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- The discussion of a community calendar is a frequent flyer during community needs conversations and trying to organize all our wonderful nonprofits.
- That's great to run with that.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment.

Kyle Falbo commented as follows:

- It's my hope that the City can remind the public of what this contract for Relaunch Sebastopol Consultant has been, how much they have paid out so far and what the expected revenue generation.
- Perhaps this is more of a question to the subcontractor.
- What the expected revenue generation for the City might be, if they can quantify it now as a result of Relaunch Sebastopol.

Mayor Slayter responded to public comments as follows:

- To answer the question from the member of the public, on the first page of the agenda item it says the general fund cost is $96,000.
- That's how much the Council has approved for this contract.
- As far as where we are billings to date, that is somewhat irrelevant because the work is to front loaded and I'm not even sure that a to the minute reporting of what the billing and invoicing is useful in any way at this point.
- It's really the total that's the important thing when you're talking about a municipal budget.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- The contract itself is $86,000.
- The Council approved an additional $10,000 to it to cover the special and unique insurance needs.

<u>City Council Discussion and/or Deliberations:</u>
Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- The expectation is greater vitality and what that means to our community and it may cost a little bit to have a nicer environment downtown

- We heard from members of the public about a Caltrans planning grant and the desire for a more pedestrian and cycle friendly downtown.
- It's not like you can directly quantify what the value of those items is.
- A more pedestrian friendly downtown will bring more pedestrians.
- Pedestrians tend to be the ones that wander into stores.

Relaunch Sebastopol Consultant commented as follows:

- Clearly it's hard to quantify when you improve an area you assume it will cause increased shopping.
- The only way I've been able to think about how we could possibly confirm that is by looking at a change over the months of taxes collected from businesses.
- That's really the only way I can conceive of getting added.
- There are kind of obscure pedestrian traffic counting, but I think a better approach might be to sort of look at the tax base and how that improves.
- It's such a long, drawn-out process that a month to month change is irrelevant really.
- We're looking at long-term systemic change and vitality.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- The collaboration we are seeing, that is significant attitude change.
- It's particularly important coming out of the pandemic to get our businesses energized and all of the people behind this beautification and interest in ramping up our City.
- I don't think that's quantifiable but is measurable.
- We see it in the excitement at tonight's meeting from our consultants.

Relaunch Sebastopol Consultant commented as follows:

- I just want to put in another thumbs up for the Caltrans planning grant, which I think is a great idea.
- $86,000 is a small amount of money when you look at making systemic change to a town.
- The kind of money Caltrans could bring could make a real difference.
- I also want to urge the City to perhaps start looking at it a little sooner than July, because the workshops on applying for the grant begin this month.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Thank you for that heads-up.
- I'll note that to staff to check the schedule on the grant and the workshops and any other preliminary information about that.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I just wanted to say I'm so grateful to our consultants for their building on all the work that's been done in the past.
- That was I think one of the most important things for them to do and for this Relaunch program to do, because they've gone through this iteration so many times of starting a new project and then we get new tag lines and branding and then we start again and three years later we start it again.
- I'm so grateful for their discovery phase and figuring out what we've already done and building on it and with lightning speed jumping into making something happen.

City Council Action: None Taken. Informational Item Only.
Reference Order Number: 2022-138

REGULAR CALENDAR AGENDA ITEMS (DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION):

11. Report from Committee for the Unhoused (Requestor: Ad Hoc Committee/City Administration)

The Committee for the Unhoused presented the agenda item recommending the City Council receive the report and take actions on the various requests.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- If you recall, Mayor Slayter and Councilmembers, the plan had been for the committee to end its lifetime here in this evening's meeting.
- You'll see what we are proposing is that we extend the ad hoc committee one more month in order to give us a chance to wrap up some final steps.
- I'm going to give you the overview of what we're hoping to have the City Council address tonight.
- The staff report is set up with these issues presented at the beginning in a summary fashion and then also at the end and an action item sort of arrangement.
- The first item we are hoping to have the City Council take action on is involving grant writer. This is a theme we're hearing over and over.
- So we would encourage the City Council to look at requesting that the budget committee consider the selection of a grant writer to maximize the opportunities for grants and funding to address needs for the unhoused.
- The second topic is warming and cooling centers. You'll see that we are asking that the City Council support the idea of a warming/cooling center and ask that our Fire Chief fill out a detailed warming/cooling center proposal including consideration of support and oversight by West County Community Services.
- The third item is the West County Community Services contract with an outreach worker itself.
- That's a new contract the City funded for the first time this year. That's Jennifer Lake, who as we all know has been amazing in the success and outreach and impact she's had on the unhoused.
- If you haven't already taken a look, I'd recommend that members of the town Council and the public take a look. It's pretty impressive.
- First item, grand writer. Second, warming/cooling center. Third, contract, we strongly recommend it be renewed.
- The fourth item is the West County contract for Park Village. We would urge that it be renewed.
- I'll make the point here just as a reminder that what the ad hoc was tasked with doing was assessing needs regarding the unhoused and providing preliminary proposal to address those needs.
- That's what we're looking at as our action items.
- The fifth item is to encourage our Police Chief to continue to research mental health resources, including a mental health response team and that we specifically ask our hard working Chief to come back by no later than April of next year to report back on those efforts.
- As we know from his report, I think at the last meeting he expects it to take a year or two for him to identify an appropriate partner in that effort.
- The sixth item is to support continued sanitation services to the extent that they're needed.
- That would be included in the budget as necessary and that would be specifically any continuing porta potties or hand washing stations.
- Number seven is extend the ad hoc to May 17 to allow the completion of final measures.
- As an example, we need to effectively transition to a staff liaison, which will likely be the Planning Department, but that process will take some time.

- That seventh item is to extend the ad hoc to May 17 and then to the extent that we are extended to May 17 we would then come back by May 17 to propose the identification of a staff liaison and a Council liaison to service providers and the creation of a new ad hoc just for RV Village property searches.
- That's the seven primary items that we're bringing before the City Council and asking for action and consideration, discussion and direction.
- The three last items, we're hoping the City Council will let us hold off until May 17 to address them.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I think the importance of including the notion of warming and cooling centers as part of our emergency planning, because when there is extreme heat or cold event, that is an emergency situation.
- It needs to be part of our overall emergency plan that our emergency services have been working on.
- I just want to emphasize that's something we really need to incorporate into our emergency plan.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- The piece I would want to emphasize so we don't lose track of it is that a lot of these items we are recommending, I think speak to our already established success.
- Some of these are new, the warming/cooling center, the grant writer.
- But if you think about the City Council and as a community how much we've already supported a lot of what Councilmember Glass and I are recommending is that we just continue to support those successful efforts, the West County Community Services Contract, our Police Chief's efforts in terms of mental health outreach, our Public Work Superintendent's efforts in terms of sanitation.
- And to not again lose track of what's going on out there, the RV village is really moving forward in a tremendously successful way.
- It's heartening and the details are in the report. Adrienne Lauby is in the room tonight if you have any questions of her.

Mayor Slayter opened for questions. There were none at this time.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment.

Adrienne Lauby commented as follows:

- I want to briefly thank Councilwoman Glass and Councilwoman Rich for all the work they put into helping the Horizon Shine Village become a success.
- We're still just a little bit over two months in so there's a lot to do but it does look pretty good.
- We really couldn't have done it out the support of the staff, Larry and Mary
- I feel like we've just been kind of living underneath your wings and you've carried us through a lot of the bureaucracy and problems we've had getting it set up.
- We got the electricity in this week.

<u>City Council Discussion and/or Deliberations:</u>

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I'd like to thank the ad hoc committee for such a thorough and detailed report.
- I'm hopeful that the public will read every word and recognize how much these two Councilmembers have put into terms of life, energy and life into this work as well as Adrianne and her staff have made this dream become a reality.
- It's a very important accomplishment.
- I support all seven of the recommendations.

- My only concern is that we not move too slowly. Let's make it happen.
- I'm very much in favor of getting the grant writer online.
- I'm in favor of letting the ad hoc continue its work and do the town hall.
- I'm in favor of working with the West County Community Services.
- All of those seven items I fully support.
- Thanks again to our ad hoc and our staff and everyone.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- For one, I am fine with the ad hoc continuing.
- In fact, just to give them a little less pressure since our Council meetings go so long and I'm on agenda review, I would say we should authorize them to continue through June 30th or until such time they're ready to come back with a report so there's not a lot of pressure.
- I am fully in favor of the warming and cooling center. I think that not only serves unhoused but serves all citizens of Sebastopol, all of us.
- My home doesn't have air-conditioning and especially our older residents that might need to use something like that, I think that need to for sure be in our emergency response and serves everyone and we should move quickly on that.
- I'm also in favor of renewing, of course, the Park Village contract with West County Community Services.
- That's an auto for me.
- I'm also in favor of approving, at least for one more year although I do want to point out it is no longer funded by the monies we got from the county and would be funded by our City, the West County social worker.
- I'm willing to approve it for another year.
- I think we still have a lot and a homeless crisis going on, but I want to say publicly that I think we should look at that year to year and try to figure out how we can fund it sustainably for this small City because we have to make choices.
- That's a choice I'm willing to make this year, but I think we have a lot of choices to make.
- So with that, a lot of choices to make, this is not our only demand.
- I would not necessarily be in favor of the porta potties at this point unless we could get some sort of funding.
- I would have to trust where the subcommittee thinks if it's worth it to fund a grant writer to get funds to fund all these things, I'm in favor of it and I'd like to see that come through.
- But we've already heard in a previous presentation about another grant funder.
- I think I've heard grant people on at least four different projects we've got going on in the City.
- So I have to rely on the subcommittee for that part of, I guess, my support.
- That's where I'm coming down. I can't say all seven, but I think I've got five in there.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Refer to budget subcommittee
- My take on this is I think we've got a couple of things that are clearly noted in the report as referred to the budget subcommittee for preliminary vetting and possible inclusion and that's basically how everything happens in the City as far as budgeting goes annually.
- So to have the budget committee take a look at the grant writer funding for the services and facilities provided by public works, the porta potties and other item is really where we are at this point.
- We're not doing the trash removal like we were.
- The extension of the ad hoc committee, I would agree with the Vice Mayor. I'm fine through the end of the fiscal year.

- The renewal of the West County Community Services contract, the Park Village and the social worker position, I'm wondering if Councilmember Glass can provide a little insight as to potential funding from the continuum of care.
- I know the reconstituted Continuum of Care is just now cranking up and getting busy, so if you have anything you might be able to add as far as the work of that committee and specifically any funding that might be available to us.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Actually I have a meeting with the Continuum of Care on Thursday this week.
- Hopefully I'm going to find out more about how the allocations are in terms of providing outreach services, that there is kind of a debate in the COC regarding investing in outreach services and care versus investing in permanent housing that's going to solve the problem.
- So on part of that debate, I think the outreach part really needs to happen, because we need to get to the permanent part.
- So I will be participating in that meeting Thursday and getting more information.
- The other thing that's going on is the county has a large amount of ARPA funding that is also for unhoused issues.
- They're operating separately from the COC.
- So one of the things I'm hoping that we tackle on Thursday is how are we going to dovetail one-time ARPA funding that is coming in for homeless services with the policies of the COC so we actually achieve something all going in the same direction.
- I would hope part of what comes out of that ARPA funding is also going to help with the outreach services that are needed.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I know I am particularly enthused and I'm sure my colleagues are as well about the reconstituted Continuum of Care, that small cities get a real seat at the table rather than a random individual representing us who wasn't really from even West County.
- I'm hopeful this really works this time.
- The warming/cooling center, to me this just happens to be landed in a committee for the unhoused.
- This is really about emergency response and it's for everyone. It's not simply for the unhoused or the perilously housed.
- We need to incorporate this into our emergency plan and figure out how we can make it happen funding wise. That sounds like something that will need to be referred to the budget committee.
- The last thing on the list here, out of order, is the exploration of the mental health resources. The Chief has reported on that. We heard it at our last meeting.
- Ad hoc committee members mentioned it, that that's in the works and this is something that takes a bit of time to identify the correct response method and provider.
- So I trust our Chief to figure that part of it and come back with a recommendation.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I just wanted to make sure that in the midst of these 119 pages of a staff report everyone's aware of the last two pages which is a two-page Continuum of Care funding information and calendar spreadsheet that we got courtesy of Councilmember Glass's participation.
- It's a really complete overview of funding opportunities.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I just also want to mention that is continually updated.
- So I expect to be providing an updated version of that sometime in the next couple of months because they are in the process of updating.

MOTION:

Councilmember Glass moved and Councilmember Gurney seconded the motion to approve the following:

1. Grant Writer
   a. Recommend City staff work with the Budget Committee to consider allocation of funding for a grant writer to seek out and obtain funding for City needs related to the unhoused. This item will be reviewed during the Budget Committee meetings with the final decision to be made at the City Council Budget Hearing scheduled for June 2022.
2. Warming/Cooling Center
   a. Direct the Director of Emergency Services to incorporate a plan for warming/cooling centers into the Emergency Operation Plan and recommend the Fire Department include funding in the Fire Department Budget for Budget Committee review and final decision by the City Council.
   a. Direct that the Director of Emergency Services consider having WCCS oversee the warming/cooling centers, and that this addition to WCCS's services be incorporated into the existing WCCS contract (see item 4 in this "Key Questions" section), subject to input and direction by City administration.
3. WCCS Contract for Services to the Unhoused
   a. Recommend City staff work with WCCS to provide a recommendation to the Budget Committee for funding allocation for this contract. A final contract and funding will be provided to the City Council for review and approval at a future City Council meeting.
   b. Direct that the WCCS contract specifically include oversight of safe overnight parking volunteer coordination.
   c. Support reimbursement to hosts of safe parking locations for confirmed out-of-pocket costs.
   d. Recommend that any agreement to have WCCS oversee the warming/cooling centers be incorporated into the existing WCCS contract (see item 2 in this "Key Questions" section), subject to input and direction by City administration. A final contract and funding will be provided to the City Council for review and approval at a future City Council meeting.
4. WCCS Contract to Manage Park Village
   a. Recommend City staff work with WCCS to provide a recommendation to the Budget Committee for funding allocation for renewal of the contract to manage Park Village. A final contract and funding will be provided to the City Council for review and approval at a future City Council meeting.
5. Mental Health Resources to Meet City Needs.
   a. Direct the Police Chief to continue expand as appropriate the use of County resources to serve mental health needs in Sebastopol.
   b. Direct the Police Chief to continue exploration of mental health response team options, including possible partnerships with other jurisdictions offering these services.
   c. Direct the Police Chief to provide a status report to the City Council on mental health resources no later than April of 2023.
6. Sanitation Efforts (porta-potties etc)

a. Create an Ad Hoc RV Village Property Search Committee, to last until November 1, to be tasked with assisting SAVS in identifying a viable option for a future relocation site for the lived-in vehicles currently housed temporarily at Horizon Shine.
b. Appoint two City Councilmembers to the new Ad Hoc RV Village Property Search Committee.

7. Extension of Ad Hoc Committee to June 30, 2022
    a. Direct that the Ad Hoc Committee for the Unhoused be officially extended an additional 30 days until June 30, 2022 to allow the Committee to address and finalize outstanding issues. It was anticipated that this Committee would be disbanded as of April 19, 2022; however it is anticipated that an additional 30 days is needed for the Committee to fully complete its assigned tasks.

Discussion:

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I'm a little unclear on the motion
- I thought the direction was for the budget subcommittee to review these recommendations and make recommendations, but I heard the motion say the City Council was approving all seven recommendations.
- I'm not sure what I'm voting on.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- The recommendations were to refer it to the committee.
- Incorporated into each of these items is the requirement that they be referred to the budget committee as part of the budget committee process.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I need to understand what I'm voting on because I'm not voting to approve these.
- I'm voting to have the budget subcommittee review them and make recommendations within the budget.
- That's the motion?

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- That's the motion.
- The end of my motion said subject to approval and deliberation by the budget subcommittee.
- There are specific directions to other staff as well, not just the budget subcommittee.
- That's why I specifically said that the motion is to approve our recommendations, specifically anything fiscal needs to be vetted and approved by the budget subcommittee.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Requested the motion reference the exact contents of the recommendation language.
- That is, I believe, what the motion was.
- A simple motion would be to adopt the recommendations as set forth in the staff report, all of them do, I think, what the vice mayor has requested and send the financial items to the budget committee for a recommendation to the Council.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Some of these recommendations will be as relevant June 30th as they are right now and I would appreciate if the continuing ad hoc committee reviews these again and gives us an update, for instance on the Council liaison position.

- I would hoping the Council ad hoc committee would be interested in doing that between now and their new expiration date.
- To continue the items one through three (although listed one through four in the agenda item)
- That's just what I was hoping you would understand from me and perhaps the whole Council that we would like you to do and appreciate you doing.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- That's exactly the expectation I think Councilmember Glass and I have
- It is great that we're being extended to June 30, but our hope is to close up the ad hoc as soon as possible and continue the work we've been assigned with a focus on the remaining three items even though they're numbered one, two and four.

Councilmember Gurney amended the motion and Councilmember Glass seconded the amended motion to approve the recommendations 1-7 as set forth in the staff report and send the financial items to the budget committee for a recommendation to the Council with the amending of the extension of the committee through June 30th and not May 17th as noted in the report.

Mayor Slayter called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.

VOTE:

Ayes:	Councilmembers Glass, Gurney, Rich, Vice Mayor Hinton and Mayor Slayter
Noes:	None
Absent:	None
Abstain:	None

City Council Action: Approved the following actions:

1. Grant Writer
   b. Recommend City staff work with the Budget Committee to consider allocation of funding for a grant writer to seek out and obtain funding for City needs related to the unhoused. This item will be reviewed during the Budget Committee meetings with the final decision to be made at the City Council Budget Hearing scheduled for June 2022.
2. Warming/Cooling Center
   a. Direct the Director of Emergency Services to incorporate a plan for warming/cooling centers into the Emergency Operation Plan and recommend the Fire Department include funding in the Fire Department Budget for Budget Committee review and final decision by the City Council.
   b. Direct that the Director of Emergency Services consider having WCCS oversee the warming/cooling centers, and that this addition to WCCS's services be incorporated into the existing WCCS contract (see item 4 in this "Key Questions" section), subject to input and direction by City administration.
3. WCCS Contract for Services to the Unhoused
   a. Recommend City staff work with WCCS to provide a recommendation to the Budget Committee for funding allocation for this contract. A final contract and funding will be provided to the City Council for review and approval at a future City Council meeting.
   b. Direct that the WCCS contract specifically include oversight of safe overnight parking volunteer coordination.
   c. Support reimbursement to hosts of safe parking locations for confirmed out-of-pocket costs.
   d. Recommend that any agreement to have WCCS oversee the warming/cooling centers be incorporated into the existing WCCS contract (see item 2 in this "Key Questions" section), subject

to input and direction by City administration. A final contract and funding will be provided to the City Council for review and approval at a future City Council meeting.

4. WCCS Contract to Manage Park Village
    a. Recommend City staff work with WCCS to provide a recommendation to the Budget Committee for funding allocation for renewal of the contract to manage Park Village. A final contract and funding will be provided to the City Council for review and approval at a future City Council meeting.
5. Mental Health Resources to Meet City Needs.
    a. Direct the Police Chief to continue expand as appropriate the use of County resources to serve mental health needs in Sebastopol.
    b. Direct the Police Chief to continue exploration of mental health response team options, including possible partnerships with other jurisdictions offering these services.
    c. Direct the Police Chief to provide a status report to the City Council on mental health resources no later than April of 2023.
6. Sanitation Efforts (porta-potties etc)
    a. Create an Ad Hoc RV Village Property Search Committee, to last until November 1, to be tasked with assisting SAVS in identifying a viable option for a future relocation site for the lived-in vehicles currently housed temporarily at Horizon Shine.
    b. Appoint two City Councilmembers to the new Ad Hoc RV Village Property Search Committee.
7. ~~7.~~ Extension of Ad Hoc Committee to June 30, 2022
    a. Direct that the Ad Hoc Committee for the Unhoused be officially extended an additional 30 days until June 30, 2022to allow the Committee to address and finalize outstanding issues. It was anticipated that this Committee would be disbanded as of April 19, 2022; however it is anticipated that an additional 30 days is needed for the Committee to fully complete its assigned tasks.

Minute Order Number: 2022-139

Mayor Slayter moved item number 13 prior to item number 12.

PUBLIC HEARING(s):

13. Public Hearing - rescinding of Resolution 5813 and adoption of Resolution XXXX – Resolution of the City Council of the City of Sebastopol to Establish Parking Violation Fines. Based on the comparison with other Sonoma County cities, staff recommends the City of Sebastopol's parking fine structure be modified as follows and authorizes the City Manager to increase the following fines annually in accordance with the CPI and make any annual adjustment to fines, not to exceed a $50.00 difference for each category fine, as necessitated by county and private service processing fee increases:

Category I:	Current $20.00	Proposed $40.00
Category II:	Current $25.00	Proposed $50.00
Category III:	Current $30.00	Proposed $60.00
Category IV:	Current $40.00	Proposed $80.00
Category V:	Current $275.00	Proposed $425.00

(Responsible Department: Police)

Police Chief Kilgore presented the agenda item recommending the City Council approve rescinding of Resolution 5813 and adoption of Resolution XXXX – Resolution of the City Council of the City of Sebastopol to Establish Parking Violation Fines. Based on the comparison with other Sonoma County cities, staff recommends the City of Sebastopol's parking fine structure be modified as follows and authorizes the City Manager to increase the

following fines annually in accordance with the CPI and make any annual adjustment to fines, not to exceed a $50.00 difference for each category fine, as necessitated by county and private service processing fee increases:

Category I:	Current $20.00	Proposed $40.00
Category II:	Current $25.00	Proposed $50.00
Category III:	Current $30.00	Proposed $60.00
Category IV:	Current $40.00	Proposed $80.00
Category V:	Current $275.00	Proposed $425.00

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- You talked about loss. We certainly don't want to be losing money with what we pay the county.
- Have you done the same exercise with the new proposed rates to see if we'd actually be making money and about how much that same exercise would do if we doubled the cost?
- Could you do the quick math on that?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- No, I can't. All of these depend on how many parking citations we would write.
- So, for me or any member of my staff to go through and tally up what the citations were and what those fines currently are, I can tell you there have been by just our Police Technician alone in the first four months of this year, I believe she's written over 300 tickets.
- So, I don't have the availability or the time to go through to find out what each of those fines were for the processing fees and what have you.
- And going forward, for those citations it really just depends on the number of citations that are written and what they're written for.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I think that answered my question actually.
- I'm surprised. I was wondering how many citations a year. 300 citations
- In terms of you're confident that these fees would be consistent with what other jurisdictions are charging in Sonoma County, Chief Kilgore.
- I just want to confirm that you are confident that these new proposed fees are consistent with what you're seeing throughout Sonoma County.

Chief Kilgore commented yes they are.

Councilmember Rich commented do you have any idea how many of the handicap citations are issued?

Chief Kilgore commented I don't have a number on those, no.

Councilmember Rich commented to the extent a citation is not paid by the person cited, what is the next enforcement step?

Chief Kilgore commented it goes to the processing folks, who I believe send them to collections.

Councilmember Rich commented so these are not citations that would result with an individual being incarcerated?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- No. We don't have time to take people to jail for parking tickets.
- Quite honestly, our jails won't accept people for parking tickets. They're overcrowded as they are.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Thank you, Chief, for this report.
- I just wanted to make a minor request regarding the spreadsheet
- What would have really lit up my little brain is if there was City of Sebastopol now and then the columns that are Petaluma, Sonoma and if there were one more column that would have said suggested new fee.
- Because when I look at this and I'm going category one, category two and it doesn't quite translate into the list.
- That would have like illuminated me a little bit more, but thank you for the report.
- So I had a question about, do you know, Chief, if there are any potential changes to existing signs that would be required?
- I know that in some places I have seen disabled parking, handicapped parking that the fine is actually listed as a deterrent.
- Do you have if we have any of those situations in our public lots?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- To my knowledge, I don't believe that we do.
- We can always order new signs.
- It's just a cost that is incurred by the City and I don't know what that cost would be and how many we would need.
- Many of these where handicapped parking might be on private property such as a grocery store lot.
- I don't know that the City actually posts those signs.
- I think those might be posted by the businesses.
- That's one of the very few parking violations that we can enforce on private property, is handicapped parking and fire lane parking as well.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- On page 7 of 7 it's the chart.
- There are a handful of items on here, obstructing traffic, parking in an intersection, obstructing bike path, fire lane.
- Those are listed at $147.
- That does not sync up with a category.
- I'm curious if you can explain what those are and what category they land in.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- That's a good question.
- No, I can't explain what they are and I can't tell you why they're listed at that.
- The report was given to me by our Police Technician.
- I don't have an answer for you.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I'm not sure that that's a vital import this evening, but those are at $147 at the existing, the current cost.
- If we're looking at doubling that basically turns into nearly a $300 citation that's not accounted for in our schedule.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- It looks to me like there are only one, two, three, four, five of those that don't fall into this category.
- My guess is that we don't have a whole lot of those that we write those citations for, but if you'd like an amendment, we can do an amendment.
- I would say that it probably would be in the best interest to move forward with the categories that are present.
- If we see there's a need to address those specifics, then we will.
- This is the information that I was given by our Police Technician and that I'm operating under.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I look at these dollar amounts and I have to ask myself at what point are they so punitive that they really go beyond meeting the need to discourage violations.
- The one that really strikes me in that category is the 425 for category five.
- I'm the first person to be offended if someone actually has the gall to take a handicapped spot, but how much discouragement, more discouragement to those people do we get when we compare $275 to $425?
- That seems like a whole heck of a lot of money, especially in these economic times.
- So I'd be curious to hear from my fellow security Councilmembers how you feel about that.
- Does that feel like a fair amount?
- Our Police Chief is recommending it, but I look at it and I go, wow what about 350?
- $425 could really, really cause economic damage to people.

Mayor Slayter opened the public hearing.

Kyle Falbo commented as follows:

- The agenda item tonight is being sold on the back of a financial argument.
- The claimed need for this increase, to quote the agenda directly, mitigate the City from incurring a net loss as a result of paying more for county processing fees than what Is actually being generated from the citations.
- The first question I have is, just how long has the City been allowing their current fines to be resulting in a loss?
- That is, how long exactly has the issuing of parking violations related in this net loss?
- Second question would be, just how much money specifically in total has been lost as a result of essentially the City paying for the processing of police issuing parking violations and failing to update the fine schedule regularly?
- The financial loss and argument brings up a broader concern, financial losses as a result of police actions.
- For this agenda action, the financial loss occurring from out of date fine scheduling but the result of other police practices, namely civil litigation as a result of police actions.
- I know better than to ask the City to comment on ongoing litigation or fall back on the good old insurance we have
- We public need to know how much money has been paid out in litigation as a result of police practices and past litigation that the City has been involved with.
- Providing a single line item in a budget is not specific.
- Following a bill signed in September of last year adjusting law enforcement's individual liability being charged with wrongdoing, including sexual assault, excessive use of force and perjury, but to not stray too far from the original agenda item I'll close with this.

- If the City is willing to start a conversation of adjusting fines imposed by law enforcement under the argument of finance, it's my hope the City will speak to the finances of law enforcement as a whole.

Jim commented as follows:

- I feel like a doubling of the parking fees is too much.
- The numbers I've heard, 300 tickets so far.
- I'm going to round up to a thousand.
- That's $20,000 in fines and we lost $800.
- By doubling everything, this is just my math, $40,000 coming in.
- That should light a fire under people abusing our parking violations but I really worry the people that stay a little too long at dinner that don't know that their tire was chalked or didn't read the sign are going to come out for a $60 ticket and it's going to have a detrimental effect to how we're seen as a town.
- It just seems like a revenue generating thing to me, the way these things are done regardless of whether they're in line with other communities.
- I don't see the spreadsheets so I don't know what it's like in other small towns.
- Then to automatically go onto a cost of living increase in the fines, this sounds like revenue generating by writing tickets and I don't like it.
- I'd like to see a smaller increase, maybe ramping up $5 per fine or $10 per fine or something like that.

Natalie commented as follows:

- I just want to echo Jim.
- I think I remember a time when the police department was looking for a new building and there were sirens everywhere and it was like generating interest in building a new place for the police department.
- Well, they have that and we have a wonderful new police guy.
- I don't think we need to generate income through what Jim said these high rates of ticketing.
- But I always park in the same place when I go downtown in a public lot and I've never had a problem.
- So I hope everybody else does the same.

Hearing no further comments, Mayor Slayter closed the public hearing.

<u>City Council Discussion and/or Deliberations:</u>

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- The public comments raised a question for me that I'm hoping we could take a minute for the Chief to answer.
- I'm wondering how much of your staff's time is devoted to parking enforcement.
- I'm anticipating it's a rather small percentage.
- Having been somebody who's parked downtown for too long many days in my life here as a resident, I would not been caught as many times as I deserve.
- It would be helpful to know from you how much of your staff time is dedicated to enforcement.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- Unfortunately, not enough because we don't have the staffing for it.
- So, we address the matters. A lot of them are complaint driven.
- A lot of them are served by our Police Technician.
- Our police technician works varied days, and she sees what she sees and she handles what she handles.

- We get complaints and we go out there and address them, but not enough of our time is spent on this and certainly not enough time that would generate what is believed to be a revenue that is worthy of anything.

Councilmember Gurney commented are you anticipating increasing those hours in a future budget?

Chief Kilgore commented it would depend on what Is approved in the budget.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- As I'm hearing your remarks, we don't have a hostile environment for people who want to park in town currently.
- Actually, we're very welcoming in the sense that you don't have the staff power to enforce it, as much as might be more appropriate.
- We do not have a hostile environment for people parking.

Chief Kilgore commented no, it is not.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- One, to address our speaker, it is a little unfair and I appreciate the Chief bringing it forward tonight because he's brand-new.
- We haven't reviewed it. I certainly haven't seen it before tonight. So I think it is a little unfair.
- Some things do slip through the cracks. Thanks for bringing it forward.
- Certainly not your fault that we have brought rates up over ten years.
- With that said, I am also not in favor of bringing it up at the recommended levels.
- I think more appropriate would be 25% across the board, maybe with a round number.
- We are in the middle of the highest inflation that we've seen, and it's climbing.
- Anybody that watches the index knows that, and I think that now is not the time to double across the board all our parking rates and actually make money on it.
- The other thing that I don't like is the suggested escalator that would happen every year.
- I think we should raise rates tonight if we see fit and then we should have it on the to do list and it is appropriate coming through the police department like we look at that and we look at water rates every couple years so we can decide what's appropriate.
- But I hesitate to put any type of auto escalator in with economic times and the uncertainty we have experienced in the last few years.
- So I would not be in favor of that.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I'm in agreement with the Vice Mayor that this escalation is too much too fast.
- I am just looking at the highest one, which is the $425 one which has to do with parking in a disabled parking space.
- I would think most people know about parking, that they shouldn't be parking in a disabled parking space.
- When I'm looking at what other cities are charging, they're charging $360, $500, $350 and $353.
- So this isn't incredibly large because there are other cities that are charging more.
- It is one of those things that does kind of deserve a hefty fine because people do know.
- Unless the place is really not marked well, which I think does happen on occasion.
- It's maybe a mistake because it's not marked well.

- But the rest of them, going from $25 to $50, for some people that ends up being a pretty hefty amount of money.
- So I'm in agreement we need a smaller increment up and not an automatic accelerator.
- The level of inflation is really difficult for working people right now, so I am really concerned about that.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I would just like to note that anything that the City Council wishes to do as far as amending these numbers is fine, and I think can be done tonight as far as that amendment goes on these categories.
- I will say this is a very simple resolution for people in order to not be subjected to these fines, which is obey the law and don't park in places you are not supposed to park in and you won't have to worry about those fines, and I would hope especially those related to the handicap parking that people are abiding by that and not utilizing it like we typically see, which is a convenience for people to run into a place and run back out so that they don't have to walk a specific distance.
- That's just a response to things that are happening.
- As far as the inflation goes, I don't know how the City looks at the water rates, if that's on a recurring basis or when that comes through.
- I put the escalation clause in there because I think that it's a simpler way to deal with these matters that are on a recurring basis that could happen on an annual basis rather than every two or three years.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Thank you for that explanation.
- My take on this is that is something the City looks at infrequently and historically it has been.
- We have the dates about the last couple of times this was looked at and it is certainly not in our recent past.
- So having an annual or some sort of schedule and to answer the Chief's question about water rates, there is no rule on that.
- It is generally when water rates are increased it is over a period of time and they ratchet up and I'm wondering, listening to my colleagues, if that is the direction we would like to go this evening with this.
- Honestly for me, the doubling of these fines, yeah, it's a doubling, but at the same time I look at what other cities are doing and I don't know how long it's been since the City of Sonoma has looked at their rates or the other cities.
- So I'm actually in the minority here.
- But I also hear what my colleagues are saying and can understand moving into a situation where maybe We increase them now and then we establish a step for the future.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I'm noting historically I signed the resolution that the Chief is asking to rescind in 2010.
- The previous resolution was 1993 by Mayor Lynne Hamilton.
- Look at how behind we are.
- People have had the great opportunity to park and violate and receive low fines, so I'm actually in favor of the Chief's recommendation.
- I think it is very reasonable to come up to speed and be comparable to other cities and counting on the good will of our residents.

MOTION:

Councilmember Gurney moved and Mayor Slayter seconded the motion to approve rescinding of Resolution 5813 and adoption of Resolution XXXX – Resolution of the City Council of the City of Sebastopol to Establish Parking

Violation Fines. Based on the comparison with other Sonoma County cities, approval of City of Sebastopol's parking fine structure modification and authorizes the City Manager to increase the following fines annually in accordance with the CPI and make any annual adjustment to fines, not to exceed a $50.00 difference for each category fine, as necessitated by county and private service processing fee increases:

Category I:	Current $20.00	Proposed $40.00
Category II:	Current $25.00	Proposed $50.00
Category III:	Current $30.00	Proposed $60.00
Category IV:	Current $40.00	Proposed $80.00
Category V:	Current $275.00	Proposed $425.00

Discussion:

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I'll just say that I'm not in favor of the motion on the floor.
- I would be willing to kind of compromise in the middle.
- I do especially running an assisted living for the elderly think everyone knows not to park in a handicapped zone.
- I would be fine with that increase the Chief proposed tonight.
- But going back to one of our public speakers, we heard an earlier presentation by our vitality committee this morning trying to bring more people downtown.
- When you have just spent $80 or $100 at dinner and you walk out and get a big, fat ticket, I think in today's, as I stated earlier, economic times, I'm not for increasing at the proposed fine levels one through four and I'm not in favor of auto escalator.
- I think that, just like different departments bring back our rates, it's up to our departments to bring back dated rates or future City Councilmembers to review or make those decisions.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I'm not in favor of approving the request.
- My proposal just to kind of cut to the chase would be that we increase the rates by 50%, that we go from $20 to $30, $25 to $40, $30 to $45, $40 to $60.
- I take the fifth level and raise it to $350.
- So that would be my proposal and that would be a 50% increase rounded effectively.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Could we have a clarification on that alternate proposal, please?
- Are you wanting to delete the automatic review and escalation yearly?

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I'm on the fence about that.
- I don't have a decision on that piece of it.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I'm in agreement with Councilmember Rich's proposal.
- On the automatic issue, I would make it part of the resolution that our rates be reviewed annually without a fixed escalator.
- It would come to agenda review anyway

Councilmember Gurney amended the motion and Mayor Slayter seconded the amended motion to approve rescinding of Resolution 5813 and adoption of Resolution XXXX – Resolution of the City Council of the City of Sebastopol to Establish Parking Violation Fines. Based on the comparison with other Sonoma County cities, approval of City of Sebastopol's parking fine structure modification and removal of escalation language and remove escalation language (~~and authorizes the City Manager to increase the following fines annually in accordance with the CPI and make any annual adjustment to fines, not to exceed a $50.00 difference for each category fine,)~~ as necessitated by county and private service processing fee increases:

Category I:	Current $20.00	Proposed $40.00
Category II:	Current $25.00	Proposed $50.00
Category III:	Current $30.00	Proposed $60.00
Category IV:	Current $40.00	Proposed $80.00
Category V:	Current $275.00	Proposed $425.00

Mayor Slayter called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.

VOTE:

Ayes:	Councilmembers Gurney and Mayor Slayter
Noes:	Councilmember Glass, Councilmember Rich and Vice Mayor Hinton
Absent:	None
Abstain:	None

Motion Fails.

Councilmember Glass moved and Councilmember Gurney seconded the motion to approve the rate schedule as proposed by Councilmember Rich and to have the rate schedule reviewed on an annual basis.

1.

Category I:	$30.00
Category II:	$40.00
Category III:	$45.00
Category IV:	$60.00
Category V:	$350.00

Discussion:

Councilmember Gurney requested a clarification on the motion, I think there was a specific mention that the disabled violation would be $350.

Councilmember Glass stated that is correct.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- My question is actually related to the Chief.
- What would you propose that we do with the $147 fines?
- Do the same thing, escalate them by 50% and figure out which category they belong in?

Chief Kilgore commented yes.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I think we make it a round number
- $147 seems odd.

- So I would say if we're going to go up by 50%, so that's $70, so $217, I believe, is the quick math.
- So either make it $200 or make it $225 or something to that effect.
- Would that be okay with the maker of the motion and the seconder of the motion?
- There are four fees at $147 and one at $143.
- They don't show up on the category chart.
- The proposal is for $225.

Councilmember Glass amended the motion and Councilmember Gurney seconded the amended motion to approve the rate schedule as proposed by Councilmember Rich and to have the rate schedule reviewed on an annual basis.

2. Category I: $30.00
   Category II: $40.00
   Category III: $45.00
   Category IV: $60.00
   Category V: $350.00

   Fines currently listed as $143.00 and $147.00 are amended to $225.00

3. Authorizes the Parking Violation Fines be incorporated into the City User Fees to be reviewed annually.

Mayor Slayter called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.

VOTE:

Ayes: Councilmembers Glass, Gurney, Rich, Vice Mayor Hinton and Mayor Slayter
Noes: None
Absent: None
Abstain: None

City Council Action: Approved Resolution as follows:

Category I: $30.00
Category II: $40.00
Category III: $45.00
Category IV: $60.00
Category V: $350.00

Fines currently listed as $143.00 and $147.00 are amended to $225.00

Authorizes the Parking Violation Fines be incorporated into the City User Fees to be reviewed annually.

Minute Order Number: 2022-141
Resolution Number: 6423-2022

12. Public Hearing - Amendments to Parking Ordinance Language with potential discussion of permitting system (Responsible Department: Police Chief)

Police Chief Kilgore presented the agenda item recommending the City Council approve Waiving of First Reading and Introduction of Ordinance XXXX, An Ordinance of the City of Sebastopol Amending Chapter 10.76 Recreational Vehicle Parking Ordinance and Amending Chapter 10.36 of the Sebastopol Municipal Code to include permitted RV parking is desired; direct staff to return with information related to the Ad Hoc Committee's review of the City-wide staffing assessment, including costs, to properly manage and enforce permitted RV parking in

residential zoned areas of the City at a future date; and formally amend Section 10.76.040 D, Section 10.76.050 B, and Chapter 10.36.050.

Mayor Slayter opened for questions.

- It's 10.76.040, subsection D. It mentions the public buildings, police, fire, public works.
- Then you say the City Hall parking lot. To me I know that's not clear.
- I know there is a small employee lot down on admin lane, but I think of the library senior center lot as the City hall lot as well.

Chief Kilgore commented no.

Councilmember Gurney commented I'm wondering if that's confusing to other Councilmembers.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- We're talking about the City Hall parking lot.
- It's already marked for City Hall employee parking only.
- The small one that's off of the alley there is not related to the library lot.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- So as everyone knows, this is my least favorite ordinance.
- So before I start rambling on about this, I just have to say as everybody knows I seem to be in disagreement with my colleagues and disagreement with the Chief regarding this.
- This does not alter my happiness that we hired our Chief. But I do not agree with him on this.
- I'm going to ask a bunch of questions about the effect of these changes.
- These are all based on questions that I had asked previously leading up to the ordinance that was passed by my colleagues back a couple of months ago.
- So first of all, how do these changes affect if a residence or resident, property owner, who have visitors and this visitor parks in front of their home in let's say it's a Volkswagen with a bed and a sink.
- They park in front of somebody's home in a residential area while they are visiting.
- So does this just say and park there for 72 hours?
- Is that what this in the guise of saying that we're allowing unloading and unloading of people.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- Well, if I recall correctly, Councilmember Glass, one of the specific questions you asked during that Council meeting previously was are people coming in and out of the house that they are visiting considered loading and unloading?
- At that time I answered yes, and I clarified it with this additional language that is in there.
- So, the City Council made a decision to allow for 72-hour parking for those who are visitors and can show that they are visiting and that allows for the loading and unloading of people.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- So I actually did not ask that question.
- I asked what about if somebody comes to my house and then I was told that if somebody comes to dinner at my house, that constitutes loading and unloading people, which I think is rather odd terminology
- This in some way this accommodates the need for people to get in and out of my house if they're visiting me and driving that.

Chief Kilgore stated that is correct.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- What about how does this accommodate somebody who is a visitor to town and they have a camper and they need to go to the library?
- As I have seen multiple times, there is a camper that I have seen repeatedly parked outside our library which I was thinking, what's going to happen to that?
- It was a pickup truck with a camper on that.
- What's going to happen to them?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- If it's a pickup truck with a camper on the back of it, they can pull into the parking lot that is a public parking lot or any of the other business parking lots that are there.
- They're there for City-related business.
- They're frequenting the library, so they can go into the library.
- I think that's addressed in the ordinance as far as the update to the language on the City-related business under section 10.76.040d, as in David.
- So, they can still go into the parking lot and park there.

Councilmember Glass commented but they cannot park in the street?

Chief Kilgore commented they cannot park in the street; that is correct.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- So even though that lot is full like 99% of the time I go to it and they're just going to have to keep driving around until that lot has a space.
- Did you use the word "library" in this?
- I heard public works, police and City Hall. Is library named?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- No. What it says is the City-owned parking lots for the police, fire, public works and City Hall buildings may only be used when actively conducting business at those specific buildings.
- The library lot can be used for going to shopping or going to the library or whatever it may be.

Councilmember Glass commented but if that pickup truck that I see regularly parked on the street in front of the library can no longer do that or they will get a ticket.

Chief Kilgore commented or they could find another parking lot such as the Safeway parking lot or another business parking lot where they would be able to park and then walk over to the library.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- As I recall, the Safeway parking lot says it is only for their patrons, as does the Rite Aid parking lot.
- How about owners and residents, if they park on the street and they own a Volkswagen Van and they park in front of their house every day, does that mean that they have to park their vehicle a mile away after three days?

Chief Kilgore commented I think it depends on what they're using that type of vehicle for.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- If a VW van is something that is their typical mode of transportation that they utilize and also has camping abilities to it, they're not residing in the vehicle.
- It's simply a mode of Transportation.
- Doesn't this specifically say that if it is an RV that is outfitted for camping, then it is not legal.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- As I have explained in the last Council meeting that we all spoke about this, this goes back to the use of common sense, and I think that our personnel exercise common sense on a regular basis and many of these residential areas will be complaint driven, and we will assess the situation when we go to assess the situation.
- If it becomes a problem, then I think we can address it at that point in time.
- But utilizing common sense and reasonableness is something I expect our personnel does every single day.

Councilmember Glass commented so you are saying we will selectively enforce this?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- No. What I'm saying is we will provide the same equitable enforcement across the City.
- Most of the stuff we get is complaint-driven.
- However it wants to be spun can be spun, but it is not a selective enforcement.
- It is the simple matter of exercising common sense, reasonableness and exercising the expectation that I have for our folks to have conversations to try to make determinations that are best suited for the enforcement action or non-enforcement action.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- So, meanwhile, if we have residents who have visitors who come to town, those visitors are still under these revised rules, are only going to be able to park in front of the person they are visiting, they can only park there for three days.
- Then after that they will have to park their vehicle at least a mile away.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I don't know where the mile away is coming from. That mile away is related to 72-hour parking.
- That is a different statute. That is not under the RV parking ordinance.
- The 72-hour restriction is a separate entity in itself.
- A vehicle that violates the 72-hour violation is marked for a 72-hour violation.
- That vehicle then has to move at least one mile and cannot park within a half mile of the location.
- If a vehicle is parked on Morris Street and violates a 72-hour violation, that vehicle has to move one mile.
- It cannot return to a parking location within a half a mile of that original location where it was marked.
- That's a totally separate parking ordinance.
- The one as it relates to the RV parking is that City Council has approved 72 hours that is allowed for a vehicle who is visiting a homeowner, tenant or out of town visitor for loading or unloading whether that's persons or items based on this language to park in front of that residence on the street for 72 hours.
- 72 hours is not to be exceeded when a vehicle is disabled or broken down so that that can be tended to as well.
- So, there are two separate entities.

- Now there is the other part of which, which is if City Council approves parking, that is the issue of whether or not people are allowed to park their recreational vehicles on the street in residentially zoned areas after obtaining a legitimate permit.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- So without the permit system and if the grandparents of my friend's grandchild come with their Winnebago or Sprinter van and park in front of the house, then they cannot park there for a vehicle, for example?
- They will just have to move their vehicle somewhere else.

Chief Kilgore commented they can park there for the 72 hours the way that the ordinance is now.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- These are like real life examples, by the way. I'm not making this stuff up.
- I just have to reiterate, this does not resolve the problem of people who own, for example, a small camper or a trailer that they park on the street because they purchased that for the purpose of evacuating over the past few years.
- Those people will no longer be able to or actually right now they cannot park on the street.
- They will have to pay for storage of the vehicle or the trailer that may purchase.
- What happens if that's correct, right?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- That is correct.
- As mentioned in the previous discussions that Council has an ability to put a stay on any ordinance related to the parking as it relates to a fire or any type of other emergency should the Council decide to do so.

Councilmember Glass commented if we move to permitting, what effect will that have on that situation?

Chief Kilgore commented as long as they are within the guidelines of the permitting system, then they would obtain a permit that would allow them to park on a residential street in front of their house.

Councilmember Glass commented for how long can they do that?

Chief Kilgore commented there is nothing on here that allows that they have a permit; that's what that permit allows them to do.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- In terms of visitors that are coming, I just want to reiterate, visitors that are coming to town that want to stop and stay for lunch, what I was told before was that, well, if there wasn't a parking spot, they would have to park out of town and get an Uber.
- Is that still the case?
- So we have a visitor that comes to town with their sprinter van and they want to eat at one of our restaurants.
- Then are we still under the existing ordinance?
- If we move to permits, would people driving their fancy sprinter vans still be able to stop and have lunch and park on the street or could they park in one of our parking lots?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I need to make a correction on the duration and limits that we were just speaking about.
- 10.76.070 duration on limits regarding RV permits, RV permits would be allowed for up to seven days and no more than an extended seven days, so 14 days.
- So anybody would have to move those vehicles off of the roadway after they received the permits.
- So that's a clarification on the last question.
- In regard to Sprinter vans or similar vans coming in to eat at restaurants, again, they can park on any City or lot or park in another lot to do the business they need to do in the City, which would be eating at restaurants, shopping at stores, whatever it may be.
- But based on this, they would not be allowed to park on the street.
- Unless it was after 7:30 P.M.

Councilmember Glass stated isn't that after 10:00 P.M. and before 7:30 A.M., right?

Chief Kilgore commented 10:00 P.M. and cleared out by 7:30 A.M that is correct.

Councilmember Glass commented so, those people that do end up sleeping in their vehicle overnight between 10:00 and 7:30, can they move to another commercial area during the day or must what can they do then?

Chief Kilgore commented no. They need to exit because the commercial areas, communityfacility areas, and the industrial areas are no RV parking during the 7:30 A.M. to 10:00 P.M. time frame.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented first of all, I just wanted to clarify. Is the lot across from the center for the art a City lot? Because I thought it was.

Chief Kilgore stated yes it is.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I hadn't heard it or seen it addressed in the ordinance.
- Secondly, isn't the library a City-owned building?
- In which case, wouldn't it make sense to include it in that list that talks about City Hall and I had it up a minute ago here.
- So to me we're talking about City-owned buildings.
- Then the library should be included.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- We're not talking about City-owned buildings, Vice Mayor.
- We're talking about buildings that are related to emergency services and, so, the buildings that are related to emergency services are the police department, fire department, public works and City Hall.
- The reason that we specifically outlined those four buildings is because in the event of an emergency such as a fire or a flood or something else of that nature, we're going to need those parking lots for the purpose of allowing employees to come in and utilize the parking lots at City Hall and public works.
- But we also may be using those parking lots for staging emergency vehicles such as police department vehicles or fire department vehicles or public works type vehicles that are needed in emergency matters.
- So, this is not related to all City buildings, including the library.

- It is related -- the reason that we outlined the four specific buildings that we did is because they're related to needling to have actual business at those buildings and making sure those lots are cleared at all times unless you're actually doing business there in the event of an emergency and we need those lots.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I'm just reading the paragraph, and it didn't mention any emergency.
- So that's why I was confused.
- Then Councilmember Glass brought up, I want to clarify this, a truck with a camper shell.
- I thought we're a talking about vehicles that were set up with beds or slash sinks.
- Are we saying that a pickup truck with a camper shell, in which case there are a ton of them around town, are in this category?
- I just want to clarify that.

Chief Kilgore commented Recreational or RV definition means a mobile home, travel trailer, truck camper, camping trailer or other vehicle with or without power, designed or altered for human habitation for recreational or other human occupancy.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented my son drive a pickup truck that he threw a camper shell on this winter, is that in the ordinance or out?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- Depends on what's inside the camper shell.
- If it is a recreational vehicle used as such with sleeping quarters for habitation.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented so you're saying a bed would have to be in there. An empty pickup bed or whatever they throw in the back, okay, would not qualify. So camper shell does not necessarily make it a recreational vehicle.

Chief Kilgore commented that is correct.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Want to be clear about that.
- So related to the permit proposal here. Do you have any sense as just a guesstimate, because we would obviously be talking about, I think in the earlier agenda item another Councilmember asked how many tickets were given, how much staff time.
- I want to know how many, if we passed an ordinance like that, how many permits do you think we'd be issuing.
- If you can only get two permits per household in a six-month window, or, then that basically, I think, limit it is a bit.
- I'm looking for how many permits and how much staff time for the permit employee that would be issuing them down at the police department.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I have no idea.
- I don't know how many people own recreational vehicles in the City or how many are going to go out and buy them, or for those who might be already renting a location where they store that RV, if they now want to bring theirs and park it in front of their home.

- So there's no way for me to even be able to estimate that.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Let's just put it this way.
- If we implemented this, how much staff time would you be recommending to the budget subcommittee or this Council would be needed?
- I think I asked that question before.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- What I put in the staff report is that it would be recommended that a staffing assessment be completed by an outside entity, to determine how many people we would need and what the estimated plan for the use of their time would be.
- So, I don't know.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I have a really simple question.
- I want to make sure, thinking about homeowners and renters, Chief Kilgore, you have in this in your proposal, various ways that residency could be established, but I do see that you say other ways, I want To make sure that a rental agreement, and I'm looking at 10.79.080, on page eight of 13.
- I just want to make sure that a rental agreement or some other, some other proof of residency would be allowed and accepted by the police within this ordinance, that it wouldn't just be limited to the items you've listed.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- Yes, again, we go back to reasonableness.
- So, what we would typically do in that situation, if someone had a signed lease agreement or rental agreement, we would look at that, make sure the names are on there.
- Look at the identifications that the folks have that are presenting them, and if they are a matched then we would deem that as probably sufficient.

Councilmember Gurney commented I'm thinking if we were to try this out, and you encountered a number of problems or particularly a recurring problem, you would raise that to the Council and suggest a review of the ordinance, is that correct?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I don't know that this is something that we would try out or how we would do that as a trial period.
- This is going to create more staffing that is needed to effectively manage this program.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I'm not suggesting a trial period.
- What I'm saying is if we entered this ordinance realm and did this and it presented problems for you, for instance, understaffing or a recurring problem, you would point that out to our City manager and it may possibly return to the Council to fine tune an ordinance.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- That's always a possibility.

- As I mentioned in the staff report on this, we would not be able to proceed forward with permitted parking until a staffing assessment was done and people were in place to manage that properly.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented be they smoking or something else, or a problem or compliance issues it is staff's process to return to the Council if problems arise.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- A couple of questions that are sort of equipment-related.
- I'm on page five of 13 of the staff report and it talks about this is the one mile and the half-mile and those things.
- My question is, is how do you, I mean, trailers don't have odometers, and I would say virtually every single vehicle built since, easily the late '90s has a digital odometer that is not visible when the vehicle is not operating.
- I mean, just functionally, that seems, how do you, how do you prove or disprove something like that?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- If somebody was with the vehicle, we would ask to look at their odometer at that point in time.
- But, again, it goes back to reasonableness and, you know, this reality, I mean, these things are difficult to deal with.
- A lot of these things are going to be complaint driven.
- As far as the ordinance as far as the commercial, industrial and community facility areas, we really kind of curbed that issue in those with the ordinance as it's written, and with any amendments, but the 72-hour parking is for those vehicles that, again, with the way that we set this up in the timed parking in some of our areas, too, we're going to have only minimal places where this is going to probably occur.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I knew that was going to be the answer.
- That, that, you know, it comes down to the professionalism and the reasonable behavior on the part of the SPD. I trust the department. I trust your employees to be reasonable.
- Moving on to page nine of 13. This is paragraph 10.76.090, RV parking permit issuance.
- Section B and an RV permit, I think should read RV parking permit unless one of the following findings is made, the out of town visitor is not the registered owner of the RV and have the required authorization from the registered owner to use such vehicle.
- I assume it is in that paragraph where a rental RV would fall?

Chief Kilgore commented that is correct.

Mayor Slayter commented a rental agreement would be adequate proof to issue a permit.

Chief Kilgore commented that is correct.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I'm interested, Chief Kilgore, when you first brought this parking ordinance to us, it was in the context of a City-wide plan to address the vehicle issues, and it involved both the commercial industrial miss of it and the residential.
- I have noticed recently, at least in my neighborhood, some RVs that are now drive around in residential neighborhoods, seeming to find a spot to be.

- Are you getting any sort of, you know, this goes to this whole issue of our residential parking rules.
- Have you received any complaints from other citizens of Sebastopol?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- Yes, we have. We have actively addressed all areas.
- There are new signs that will be going up saying there is no RV parking at any time on the roadway.
- So once those signs are posted, then enforcement action will start to take place.
- But we have received complaints related to recreational vehicles being in residentially-zoned areas.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I'm just curious, given your, what I've heard from advocates and others is a very tolerant progressive approach with lived-in vehicles.
- Did you end up towing any vehicles on Morris or Johnson?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- We have towed a couple vehicles, but they were not towed in violation of an ordinance.
- The vehicles that have been towed have not been as a result of the ordinance.
- I would say 90%, 95% of the vehicles voluntarily complied with the ordinance.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Thank you, that's an impressive number, 95%.
- I wanted to share with Councilmember Rich and all colleagues, I've received complaints.
- I've seen those same, several vehicles cruising around.
- I've seen vehicles parked in residential neighborhoods and cruising around and referred some, a complaint very recently to the Chief which he handled.

Mayor Slayter opened the public hearing.

Kyle Falbo commented as follows:

- Caution should be taken in the amendment of the ordinance and this language suggesting in the process of exploring probable cause of a crime under this ordinance, and officers being allowed to potentially gain legal immunity to needing a warrant.
- I've spoken repeatedly that these are aimed at criminalizing homelessness and poverty, and it is through this lens we should be quite careful.
- Under the claim to view vehicle odometers is an overreach and furthers the thought of this proposed RV ban as a direct target at those whose rights We should be protecting the most.
- This radical departure of a means of enforcement of this ordinance and sub section is problematic, deserves much more discussion, especially given the digital odometers mentioned by the Mayor himself.

Jim commented as follows:

- I continue to think this ordinance is just bad. It's bad on so many levels.
- It is creating a whole bunch of problems.
- It costs a whole bunch of money
- I am fine with the RVs that people live in, driving around and finding a new place to park.
- They can park on my street for a while. If it's a problem, I'll call and they'll have to go somewhere else.
- But you're upsetting everybody that has a small trailer that wants to park it on their street, because they don't have a driveway, and they need a place to park.

- I'm talking about small things that aren't in the way, not giant things.
- That's why I originally proposed make it a 20-foot exception or something.
- I think the Chief said how do we measure that? My officers have to go around measuring how long a thing is.
- Now you're measuring how far away they went and a mile and a half-mile.
- It's like putting lipstick on a pig.
- You can't really enforce this thing correctly.
- The definition of RV is too broad.
- You have to go inside a car to find out if there's a bed in there.
- I still don't understand how it really works.
- If I have an RV, clearly an RV, and I park it in front of my house, am I at risk of getting a ticket right away?
- Or is there a chalk mark on my tire, and I have 72 hours To move it?
- If I move it, can I move it and then come back a couple days later there?
- If you're going to have a permit system and pay for people to manage permits, you should let them be yearly and say, look, I have a small trailer, it's this and this much.
- I'm going to park it on the public streets where it would be okay with it, I'm wok that.
- I think we're going to continue to go down this road of trusting the discretion of the police, which I, it's a hard job.
- That's why I think we should get rid of it and go back to the 72-hour complaint thing.

Carrie commented as follows:

- I don't like it, either.
- I'm concerned about the impact on people in our town with less means.
- Who have trailers or RVs for evacuating or because we or they can't afford expensive hotels or Airbnb stays, so maybe that's how they spend their holidays.
- But especially now, with viruses that can go from the spring to the late fall if we want to have our little escape pod handy there's this whole business of well, great, we can get a seven-day permit, what good is that, right?
- If we need our little escape pod handy and we can't fit it in our driveway or we don't have a driveway, like two neighbors that I know that I specifically have in mind, and there are others who don't have driveways, because they're these funky old Victorian homes
- What are they supposed to do?
- It gives a fee, it gives a financial hardship, an extra financial hardship at a time when gas prices are high, and, you know, there's inflation and people have lost their jobs.
- A lot of people barely are making it in Sebastopol, or, you know, our kids can't afford to live in Sebastopol.
- They can't buy, forget it. They can't buy anything. But even to rent anything, there's a lack of rental property.
- So we're just slapping this financial hardship on top of people, in addition to everything else.
- Earlier this evening we heard this wonderful ideas about bringing more people to Sebastopol and more tourists and good-feeling stuff
- The earlier proposals on the heating and cooling stations and all that make me feel so good about this town, but whenever I think about this parking ordinance, it make me feel like NIMBYs are taking control.
- People don't really care.
- They're demonizing the homeless, and they're even demonizing people who live here, and it just makes me feel bad about our town.
- I don't want to feel bad about our town.

- This should and place of compassion and caring and that's what Sebastopol is.

Arthur commented as follows:

- As the previous speaker, Kyle, has referenced, the situation with one-mile driving.
- There's no way to tell, other than looking at an odometer, which of course is inside a vehicle, whether that vehicle has driven a mile, unless the police vehicle is actively behind that vehicle, monitoring whether they have driven a mile, around about circuitous path through town until they then can park half a mile from their original location.
- There's no way to ascertain that from an odometer that's in the vehicle.
- So I think while we certainly trust our police, as Kyle had referenced, it does raise concerns about monitoring and how that can be ascertained.
- The other question, which I've tried to reach in my submitted comments is that this proposed ordinance still fails to define City-related business.
- The last time this came around, there was talk about capital C City or small C City.
- That question has never really been resolved still.
- Let's take the example of a fully unhoused RV.
- Not a fancy sprinter.
- But a vehicle that we know Is an otherwise unhoused RV that sparked to have dinner or use the library.
- Would that be included within the City-related business functions?
- Not paying taxes, not talking to police department but having dinner within the two or three-hour limit, visiting the library, walking up the hill to visit the library or would that person be swept up with some allegation that their business was not City related.

Jill commented as follows:

- I wanted to thank Chief Kilgore and the Council for this RV ordinance.
- I just, as the residents have benefited from the lower parking fines for so many year, I think residents have also benefited for many years, regarding being able to park RVs on streets, and I've lived in 23 other states and no other place have I seen that they are able to park RVs on streets for storage, even in Alaska.
- Residents have benefited for a really long time from something that most places do not allow.
- So I just, I wanted to just express my continued support for this ordinance, and I'm glad to hear that the signs are going up.
- Because we do have one serial RV dweller who's lived on our streets for a very long time, and he's pretty much on every other street I go to ever a day, South Main Street, the black RV going around.
- So I'm hoping after the signs go around that can be addressed As well.
- I just want to say thank you for the ordinance.

Hearing no further comments, Mayor Slayter closed the public hearing.

Mayor Slayter responded to public comment as follows:

- Is an RV parked in the Burnett Street lot City-related business.
- If that person is going to dinner at Hop Monk or any of the other fine establishments that provide food, and yes, under our definition, that's a lowercase C, that is City-related business.
- That is the same as going to the library, to the doctor.
- That is the same as using a park or any other facility with, located within the City limits.
- Anything that is City with a capital C related is things like visiting public works or visiting the police department.
- That's the working definition that we have on that one.

- There was a question about how does it work?
- If somebody owns a, say a van-based RV and they park in front of their own house, there's not really any difference between an owner of a house or a non-owner of a house. The rules apply.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- Mayor, you're correct. The rules apply.
- There's the 72-hour allowance that is provided to the homeowner, tenant, renter, whatever.
- If they're using that vehicle for that purpose that rule Is applicable to them as well.

Mayor Slayter discussed question probably for our City attorney and this is related to at what point are illegal search concerns raised?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- So, our officers don't conduct illegal searches.
- So, if this were the case with looking at an odometer, anything in a vehicle that's in plane plain view, including an odometer.
- Sometimes they are in digital form, sometimes they are not and they're the old-school style.
- But if it is in plain view that is correct, that is not an illegal search.
- If they have consent to look at items within their vehicle, they can do that as well.
- If the person is sitting in the driver's seat or the vehicle is running and the officer or the member of any police department can see the odometer from plain view.
- Then that is not considered a search and does not fall within a violation of anyone's search and seizure.
- So, anything in plain view in a vehicle, whether it's a gun sitting on a seat or marijuana sitting on a seat or on a floorboard or wherever it may be.
- Anything in plain view is not considered a search and can legally be done by any member of the police department who's doing that type of enforcement.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented I was just going to add, Mayor, that this ordinance does not authorize or condone any activities by police to go beyond what the Chief just mentioned.

<u>City Council Discussion and/or Deliberations:</u>

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I do have a question for the Chief, just listening to some of the comments.
- I'm going back to a remark I made particularly about my neighborhood.
- 13 houses out of 20 have an odd driveway situation.
- But I think it's not so odd around town, because just the old part of town is like this.
- There are a number of shared driveways.
- In other words, a single-car width that two houses are using to access a garage in the rear or no garage in the rear.
- We have houses where the garage door is right on the sidewalk. In other words, there's no setback.
- There's literally no driveway to that house.
- A house like mine, it has a garage but absolutely no driveway, and my garage is off the sidewalk.
- We have short driveways that are really, really steep because we're located on Calder Hill.
- So my question, given that circumstance was I think is really, in fact a resident on Ragle Road mentioned this very thing to me.

- Would it be possible to have an exception for that sort of legal situation with the property, because I'm seeing this discrepant treatment for people who have an RV and they can park it in the driveway or in their garage.
- We have a lot of people who just don't have the driveway in this old town.
- What do you think about an exception for that physical circumstance?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I think it opens up a can of worms.
- Providing exceptions for one reason, then we open up the ability to provide exceptions for everything.
- Then we just go back to there's no point in having an ordinance at all.
- So, I will go back to what I referred to in the past.
- I have been an RV owner.
- I have lived in neighborhoods that do not even allow for you to park a recreational vehicle in your own driveway.
- Whether you have a driveway or not.
- You can't park it on the street.
- You can't park it in the driveway.
- The only place that you would be able to park it would be inside your garage where it's completely covered and does not cause an issue in the neighborhood.
- So, I chose to have a recreational vehicle.
- By doing so, I had to follow the rules and the laws that were put in place, which was placing my recreational vehicle in a storage facility that I paid over $200 a month for.
- In order to store my recreational vehicle.
- That happens to be mine.
- There were other options that cost less and other options that cost more.
- The bottom line is this.
- There are privileges and advantages that you have when you are an owner of any specific item, whether it's a home or a recreational vehicle or a vehicle or whatever it may be.
- And there are sometimes applicable laws that have to be followed for those.
- And sometimes they are not great on the wallet.
- But it's, it becomes a choice in the matter.
- There's a lot of talk over emergency situations and things like that.
- I bring the Council back to the fact that the Council has the ability to stay these matters when these emergency events may be occurring.
- That would allow people to have that security or that security belief that they would be able to have their items there in a recreational vehicle to leave if they need to.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- Thank you, Chief Kilgore, I think this is all really useful information and compliment you on your complete answers to all of our questions.
- It's nice to have that sense of mutual respect where you simply provide us the information so that we can make an informed decision.
- I have one question, and then an observation.
- I'm wondering, since it's come up a couple of times, whether, and this might be, first a question for you, Chief Kilgore, but then maybe for our City Manager.

- I'm wondering whether there's an opportunity to clarify this whole lower-case City, upper-case City quandary that keeps coming up before us by simply adding a phrase at the end of that, that first sentence that would say, I think you have City lowercase City, let me get back there.
- City-owned, at any time, it's unlawful for a person to park Or leave standing any recreational vehicle in any City-owned, lowercase, parking lot at any time unless that person is conducting City-related business during business hours.
- If we could add such as for example visiting a restaurant or other local business.

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- I think the City Council is welcome to amend whatever language suits the Council for that amending.
- My draft of this was based on the mayor's definition of lower case C.
- As to applicable to all-related business within the City, when we start naming things, shopping, restaurants then it's going to come up as to, well, did it mean this as well.
- So, I like the broad use of the lowercase C, city-related.
- So that it just encompasses everything that is not related to the police department, City Hall, public works and fire department.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- Whether if we made that modification, could we still, is it limited enough that we could still move forward with this, with this recommendation with that addition.
- Does the City Manager think it's necessary or not?

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- We were advised last time, and I would reiterate that I don't think that it's necessary.
- I agree with the interpretation that the Mayor has used and others, that as were you referring to the lower case C-related business, legitimate business contained within our City.
- That is the broadest definition.
- Also we're making a record this evening as to how staff attorneys and Council interpret these.
- This record in the future can be utilized if there's ever an issue of interpretation, the City's definition or other aspects of this ordinance, you look to the record as to what the decision-makers stated at the time they passed it.
- So this very hearing that we're conducting right now is used, can be used to help interpret the ordinance in the future.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I want to recognize that there are concerns here, and I've heard concerns elsewhere, not a lot of them.
- But those that reached out merit our attention and empathy, but as I said to a number of people, as a policy-making body, we're here to make the decisions that are best for the City as a whole, and sometimes those are difficult decisions.
- I take to heart the comments that we heard from Chief Kilgore, regarding the fact that when you have an RV, there are obligations.
- I accept there's some down sides, but, down sides to the action that we would be taking tonight, but from my perspective, I just want everyone to know that I merit very much in support of the ordinance in general still and.
- Proposals that we see here, especially given that the budget committee will be examining the financial side of it.

Mayor Slayter commented the staffing committee will be looking at the staffing side of it.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- So when we talk about that small C, big C, City business thing.
- I want to confirm as City Manager/ City attorney just said, that we are including City business in the library.
- The library is considered City business. Is that, is that correct, Larry, in this interpretation?
- Or is that for us to go on record with tonight?
- I want to make sure the library's in for City business. I think it's vital

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented we try and make a broad definition so we don't have to put them in there.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I'm going to go out on a limb here since I guess we're in the deliberation area and say I, I am very worried like a member of our public spoke, that we are really detailing out this ordinance in a, too much.
- I'm concerned that had this whole parking permit thing, and it does say on the agenda item tonight that we could adopt with or without the parking permit system, I mean, you know, if I'm worried about my RV, it basically only gives me 14 days in a six-month period.
- I don't know if that's worth all the detailed in the ordinance, slash the additional staff, slash the monitoring, is that really what our public Is asking for? Because I have not heard that tonight.
- What I've heard is I can't park my RV or Van for emergencies or my visitors or because I don't have a driveway out in front of my house.
- That permit system that is proposed tonight does not address anything that I've heard from the public tonight.
- I believe had I'm leaning towards a position of the ordinance without permitting as we originally discussed.
- So I want to put that out there.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I have a couple of comments in 10.76.040 parking prohibitions, page six and seven of 13.
- But I think that we need a couple of slight modifications in here.
- In regard to capitalization.
- When, when, first sentence, as City-owned parking lot, and if we're going to be consistent in what that means, this, this would mean any parking lot located in the City, regardless of ownership, public or private.
- That's not what I believe the intent is here.
- I think what we're looking at is municipal parking lots. Capital C-owned parking lots.
- And then the next sentence it's repeated with a lower-case C.
- So I think that that tightens that up and, and more, it more closely aligns that with, with some of the other sections.
- On page 310 On five of 13. Paragraph C. Typographical error on half should be one half.
- Whether or not this stays in or not, I'm just, if it stays then it needs to be fixed.
- And also, in, where such recreational vehicle was first parked sooner than 72 hours.
- If we're tightening up the 72-hour rule, does it not apply to all vehicles?
- Not just recreational vehicles?
- I'm on page five of 13, this is, if you need the chapter, it's 10.36.010 B.

- Item C. Which doesn't make sense, but I see the "on half" that needs to be amended to one half.
- Are we tightening up the 72-hour rule for all vehicles? Or recreational vehicles?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- When I wrote this and I was writing the other one, they all start to blend together in your head.
- So, it would be a removal of recreational to state all vehicles.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- So I continue to wonder why it is appropriate for property owners across the City, taxpayers across the City, residents across the City to essentially be subsidizing recreational vehicle storage.
- I'm incredibly sympathetic to the very logical comment about, well, I have a van, and I drive it around as a regular old car, but that means then I can't park it in front of my house for more than 72 hours.
- I'm sympathetic to that.
- I just don't see where there's a logical way that we can, that we can have something that is easy to understand and therefore easy to enforce when it's, oh, well, it's a camper shell that somebody threw a mattress in the back of.
- You can cut that pie into a thousand slices and try and, you know, what ifs.
- In so many ways this, this ordinance and all discussions regarding it are that sort of well, what about this and what about that.
- I won't say that it's tiring, but it's sort of tiring. At least for me.
- There are many, many communities all over the place.
- The Chief noted personal experience with one where somebody couldn't even park an RV in a driveway, and that's, you know, that's a community choice that we're certainly not heading for. Goodness no. That's HOAs are problematic in so many ways.
- So what I see here is something that's responsive and as we're doing, editable.
- We enacted this ordinance, and now we're already looking at some revisions.
- So that's where I am at the moment.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I'm going to disagree with the Mayor
- I think this entire ordinance is really ill-advised.
- I think for so many reasons, but I could just kind of sum it up with I've lived here for 35 years.
- If I had already bought an RV then I guess you're changing the rules on me.
- So that very to now start paying to park it somewhere.
- This whole idea of that we're subsidizing RV storage; these are public streets.
- I think you get to put your publicly-owned licensed vehicle on a public street.
- I don't have a problem with that.
- But most of all, this just, to me, this is like the slippery slope of us moving into this kind of elitist, gated-style community.
- We enacted this because people are so concerned and scared of unhoused people that we end up enacting something that has all of these unintended consequences.
- Which are really taking away the feeling of community by, particularly, by people in our town that don't have a lot of money.
- Who are just regular working folks.
- If you have a driveway, as actually Councilmember Gurney mentioned, there's half the people in this town don't have a driveway they can put an RV in.

- They can't put their teardrop trailer in their driveway that's slanted like this.
- So now we're telling them, oh, they have, well, they have to take responsibility and start paying what, you know, now is at least $200 a month.
- Maybe $400 a month to store their thing.
- This isn't a problem for lots of people who are, have plenty of money and live on a big lot or whatever, but, you know, for a lot of retired folks on Social Security income or a limited income that starts to be a problem.
- just feel like we're going down the slippery slope of we are creating a little bubble, our little Green bubble like let's be like Santa Barbara or Montecito or Atherton kind of universe, and that's not what I always thought Sebastopol was about.
- I mean, I don't care about the trailer that was parked two blocks from me. It's been there for a couple years. I don't care.
- In fact, my roommate actually feels safer having it there when she walks at night, because she knows that if something, if she yells, there's going to be somebody around, because she knows who they are.
- To me, we have just gone way overboard with this, and we're not only are we creating a Sebastopol that is way different than the one I have been used to living in, but in addition to that, we're paying for it.
- We're incurring a huge amount of costs and bureaucracy to administer something so that people who want to live here, that want to live in a little bubble and are scared of certain kinds of people who weren't even that many of them, now we're creating an infrastructure to keep them out, to limit the options of working people.
- I just think, I do not think this is what's good for our community.
- I do think it sets up when the Chief, I know, I know, I'm absolutely convinced, the Chief would never deliberately go out and enforce something because he thought somebody looked weird or a person of color or, I know that's not the kind of person he is. I know that's not how our police department is.
- But the very definition of, of problematic laws that have problems for civil rights are laws that, that invite selective enforcement.
- So we may have a great Police Chief now. We may have great people on our force now.
- But that doesn't mean we should allow ourselves to have laws that can be selectively enforced, and that's just, that's the definition of laws that are problematic from a civil rights perspective.
- So I, to me, that's what's going on with this.
- It requires, you know, common sense. People using common sense. Well, the common sense means selective enforcement to me.
- I don't, you know, I've heard during these meetings, I've heard, as we have talked about this, I've heard a lot of people using the phrase those people, we need to deal with those people.
- I've heard people say that let's face it.
- The way we value our town is based on how it looks. That's how we value our town.
- That's not how, somebody said that in one of our public meetings.
- That's not how I value our town, and I don't think that's how, the way that a lot of people value our town.
- I value our town based on our residents' values and on our compassion, our intelligence, our industriousness and creativity and tolerance.
- Those are the values I think our community has been about, and to me, this does not exemplify that.
- This is the opposite of that, going in the wrong direction.
- To me, it's an ordinance in search of a problem.
- We just didn't have that big of a problem and we have an ordinance in search of a problem, and it's creating more problems than it's solving in my mind.
- There are people who are listening to me who probably think I'm a bleeding heart liberal idiot and disagree with me, I represent the ACLU contingency of this Council.

- That is the way we have been in Sebastopol, and this is going in a direction I think is wrong, respectfully, to all of my colleagues.
- I disagree.
- I think this is definitely the wrong direction.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I'm listening to everyone's comment, and I think it's so interesting that once again we're all, I think in a very respectful way, sharing our opinions.
- I respectfully disagree.
- We do have a problem.
- I have many, many people, and we have seen in these meetings, many people talk about being very unhappy with RVs parked in front of their homes.
- We are not Santa Barbara. None of us are hoping to be Santa Barbara. I certainly am not.
- I disagree that we elitist or entitled.
- I think we all need to look at all the wonderful efforts that our town has engaged in, in numerous ways.
- In one very interesting way, the comments made by Mayor Slayter and the comments made by Councilmember Glass overlap in a way that persuades me to accept the proposal at this point that was made by Vice Mayor Hinton.
- I agree that the way that this permitting system is written leaves a lot to be desired.
- I also recall Vice Mayor Hinton at one point saying, hey, can't we just test it out and see how it goes?
- I'm leaning toward still in support of the ordinance, not supporting the permitting system, for the many reasons that have already been articulated.
- Waiting to see how this ordinance is implemented, accepting the two modifications that we specifically asked our Police Chief to come forward with.
- That's where I am on this issue.
- I find it very interesting that a lot of it, a lot of, we're overlapping on an area that is really very important, which is that permitting system is not looking good.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- I got motivated again to speak, because, man, fourth generation here. I get Sebastopol.
- We are not NIMBYs.
- We are not Santa Barbara. I never lived in Southern California, that's not my place.
- I'm really frustrated sometimes that it always feels like it has to be one or the other, and I think, you know, what Sebastopol's about is a lot of different people and personalities.
- We have to kind of find what's happening.
- The only reason this parking ordinance got here is because for the last five years Morris Street has just create add huge health and safety issue for the Laguna, the kids that play baseball.
- I have to say, it's a relief to drive down there now, since we invested our time and money in the saves project to come up and try to lift people up instead of just, you know, doing nothing.
- So this community has been super supportive.
- We have housed at least 80 people, 85 people as far as I can count, and I'm sure we'll figure out ways to house more.
- I'm supportive of the parking ordinance, I'm not in support of the permit system.
- I think there's a lot that can go wrong.
- We have allowed people to park recreational vehicles in front of homes at no cost on taxpayer-financed streets.

- I'm sorry. I just, at this point, I really think we need to move forward and then see where we're at with things.
- But, you know, it's not City government's job to subsidize RV recreational vehicle parking.
- I can't even afford an RV.
- Not to say that that's everybody, but we need to make laws, I think, for the masses.
- There's always going to be somebody that's unhappy.
- So tonight I'm weighing in on the ordinance with the changes but without the permit system.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Once again we have such a range of views.
- I have first, I want to compliment Councilmember Glass. That was totally you speaking. You really hit your own points well. I enjoy how thoroughly you say that.
- I also appreciated the comments from Councilmember Rich and Vice Mayor Hinton.
- I think it's funny. The one or the other, and we're all, somebody's always unhappy. I think we are who we are.
- We clearly aren't Atherton or Santa Barbara, and we really never will be.
- I think we have a hard time being what is it Councilmember Glass, the hippie version of Oakmont?
- We don't even do that particularly well, because we do have such a range of views and a range of people and a range of lifestyles.
- We practice compassion for each other had all the way into the details and staffing at our police department.
- Many cities cannot brag of that.
- I'm interested in the permit system. I remember a time earlier in discussions, Vice Mayor Hinton, where you were both saying let's have a permit system, and I kind of want to stick with it and see how it goes.
- It may be that with the staff assessment we learn financially that it is impossible or not good at this time.
- But we don't have that information now. It may actually be workable. I really don't know.
- But that's another part in this decision making that we'll have to deal with.
- For me, the permitting is getting back to that issue of how do we want to house people?
- I think it's a commitment of our community to provide, for instance, for instance, the RV village.
- Safe parking that is a big commitment of the ad hoc committee, and a future commitment, I believe, for this Council.
- Also to provide affordable housing. Is this a capital "a" word, affordable housing? Meaning that it fits into a legally defined category?
- We're also interested in finding housing that is affordable by design.
- We really are wanting people to live in a more comfortable way than living on our streets.
- I think when we go back to the Morris Street issue, we have to recognize that we've committed to having that situation not roll into our residential streets.
- The permitting process is a pretty simple way of providing that opportunity for people.
- It is true that our old town has some problems.
- I think the Chief's answer that one exception leads to all kinds of confusion was a really solid one.
- I'm speaking again as a person who has no driveway. Has only a slanted access point to a garage door.
- Ditto to a trailer, which we crowded in there.
- I'd like us to remember where we came from, through this discussion and stick with something that we had a commitment to and see how it plays out.
- I know the Chief doesn't like to do a trial period but I think regardless, as our City Manager/City Attorney said, it's the staff's responsibility, if we create something that is problematic, the staff will let us know.

- If we have a budget problem with this, the budget committee will let us know.
- I'd like to go forward with this, with the clerical corrections that have been mentioned and see, is it really making us exclusive? I just don't think it will.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I actually am, even though I clearly don't like this ordinance very much, to say the least, I do think that if we do have something actually an annual permit for somebody that is parking, that has an RV or something like that, for them to be able to get an annual permit, where they can be parking their thing in front of their house, does not seem an unreasonable thing to do.
- An annual permit, I think, would help alleviate the issue of people who own something and they regularly park it on the street.
- They don't want to park it in another City somewhere and incur all that expense.
- So the other thing that I think is that the way that the permit process has been presented or the way that we seem to be understanding it seems really overly complicated.
- As I have mentioned a number of times, I stay in South Pasadena quite frequently with my best buddy from high school. Every time I go there, the first place I go, I stop at the police station, they stick my credit card in the machine, and it spits out a little permit. Then I can park on the street for three days in front of my buddy's house. Otherwise, he has to have any vehicle of anybody who lives in that City has to have a permit to park on the street.
- If you're a visitor, you pay so many dollars per day to park on the street in front of your friend's house. That isn't very complicated. I stick my credit card in, Put in my license plate number, take the tag and tape it to my windshield. I used to make fun of him, we don't do this in Northern California, we're so cool. We don't do this. Now we're having this introduction of the Southern California way, which I don't like.
- But if we're going to do it, I think we might want to consider this more simplified permit idea and be able to accommodate the people that do own various things like the person who has a camper, a very small, very cute camper, that is on a street on the West side of our town that wrote to us.
- His vehicle is not bothering anybody. Not bothering anybody. It's not in anybody's way. Nobody cares.
- Now we just created an ordinance to make it harder for him to live here.
- I just don't see it but simplified permitting maybe is something we should be looking at in the future.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I'm hearing general consensus that there is not big support at this point for the permit system.
- I've heard that from at least two of my colleagues.
- The staff report did note that the permit process and any potential staffing requirements, or that it was dependent upon staffing to run the program and the staffing report is pending. We all know that that is not done yet.
- The idea of an annual permit, that's an interesting one. We've not ever looked at what that would look like. Somebody with a rental agreement or home ownership, maybe there needs to be a carve-out for that.
- Maybe this is something staff needs to work on, not for us to do on the fly.
- I would like to see some procedures proposed to know if it could function.
- The other changes that we have about tightening up what capital C and lower case C, that's pretty clear.
- To Councilmember Rich's point about what situations were and we were all very familiar with in our case, the industrial area down on Morris Street and the public health hazard that that situation, it was not getting any better by itself.

- No matter how many social workers we sent down there, no matter the wonderful, good intentions of our local advocates, the humane and personalized service that the police department provided, we just kept seeing a situation that was unsafe.
- I don't know if we would have had the dangerous vehicle fires that we experienced. That could still happen, I suppose. You can't play that what if game forever.
- So we have a fairly simple revision here in front of us.
- For us to go forward with the parking permit section, not as part of the proposal, that would just mean that we could take action without approving parking permit, section 10.76.060.
- RV parking permits.

MOTION:

Councilmember Rich moved and Vice Mayor Hinton seconded the motion to approve Waiving of First Reading and Introduction of Ordinance XXXX, An Ordinance of the City of Sebastopol Amending Chapter 10.76 Recreational Vehicle Parking Ordinance and Amending Chapter 10.36 of the Sebastopol Municipal Code ~~to include permitted RV parking is desired; direct staff to return with information related to the Ad Hoc Committee's review of the City-wide staffing assessment, including costs, to properly manage and enforce permitted RV parking in residential zoned areas of the City at a future date;~~ and formally amend Section 10.76.040 D, Section 10.76.050 B, and Chapter 10.36.050 with the following amendments:

- Municipal Parking Lots – C - Next sentence as well - More closely aligns with other sections
- Page 5 of 13 - Paragraph c – Correct to One half
- Apply to all vehicles not just RV (remove recreational)
- Page 5 of 13 10 36 010 b Item C
- Remove Chapter (Parking Permit 10 76 060)
- Chapter 10.36.050.
- 10 76 040 D

Discussion:

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Suggested the motion to accept the amended ordinance under chapter 10.36.050.
- Excepting the amendments as written and including amendments to section B, where there is a typographical capital C for City-owned parking lot.
- Removal in section C of the word recreational.
- Acceptance of the amendments in chapter 10.76.040, parking prohibitions, section D. To accept the amendments as they were proposed with the change of City owned parking lots to a capital C. In section d of that section.
- Accepting the exceptions, the chapter 10.76.050 exceptions as proposed with no changes for typographical issues.
- Everything else beyond that as permits that would not be accepted in this Edition.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I'm sorry, at this hour, I find this to be really sloppy work.
- I'm wondering if it would be possible to put this up on the screen and put the Edits right on there.
- Councilmember Rich has done a valiant job tracking them.
- But I just think it would be much easier to actually see them where they are, I was going to say earlier, it would have been helpful to have a red line copy.
- But right now, I'm finding we have a lot of changes.

- If I were a member of the public, having listened to this meeting for 4 1/2 hours, we have not heard from the people who were in favor of a permitting process.
- They were previously in our audience.
- Now we're editing something without actually even seeing it.

Chief Kilgore presented the revised changes onto the screen.

- To City-owned with a capital C and the sections amending 10.36.050, use of streets for storage of a vehicle is prohibited.
- You do not see the word recreational vehicle, it's just now vehicle.
- As we continue down in section 10.76.040, parking prohibitions, section D, City-owned has been capitalized to a capital C.
- Those are all the changes that have been made.
- The City-owned parking lots for the police, fire, public works and City Hall buildings may only be used
- That's the new language that was presented in the staff report already amending the previous ordinance.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I just wanted to record to be clear here.
- It's more than just the yellow highlighted language.
- There are unedited edits.
- Did you also get the correction to the on half to one half?

Chief Kilgore commented as follows:

- We wouldn't have any of the parking permit provisions.
- What you would be looking at here is a change to sections 10.76 through, I believe, there.
- The remainder, this has been renumbered.
- But we're changing in the recreational vehicle ordinance, we would just be changing sections 10.76.040 and 10.76.050.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Ask a question directly to Councilmember Glass. Just checking in with you, Councilmember Glass, about how you're feeling about this without the permitting part.
- Is that affecting your position in any way?

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Stated no. Might be more prone to support it if we were having an annual permit process and we were allowing visitors to get a very simple permit that required practically no administration.
- So people were having to check in and get their information.
- I would be more prone to support that but I don't even think that's on the table right now.

Councilmember Gurney commented that’s what I wanted to check back with, you did mention earlier, the annual permit, then you called it that tag for the visitor on the windshield. Like your friend has you do in Pasadena.

Councilmember Glass stated yes.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- With this motion taking out all the permitting sections, where do we leave that part?
- Because I'm sitting here with a choice.

- I had an original version that had the permitting section in that I wanted to experience. Now you're taking it out.
- So I need to know from all of you, my colleagues, what we might do about the permitting issue.
- We have, I think, a couple other suggestions, perhaps.
- I just remember Councilmember Glass', because they're more recently on my notes.

City Manager/Attorney McLaughlin commented as follows:

- A couple of things, if I could.
- First of all, there is no annual permit item before the Council tonight.
- This agenda item does not support discussion of an annual permit.
- So deleting the permit language means that you're introducing changes to the ordinance, not including any permit system.
- As I said, really the agenda item does not support discussion of other types of permit systems tonight.
- We would take a long time for a proper staff work-up of any annual permit system, it would have to have a rather elaborate process, I believe.
- The next thing, I'm repeating myself endlessly here, and I apologize for that, but I'm getting some staff questions.
- It seems I'd better clarify To make sure it's understood.
- We're not re-introducing a whole ordinance.
- We're only introducing amendments.
- The original ordinance that was passed weeks ago, and went through a first and second reading, and became effective as a law remains except as amended.
- So we're only introducing the amendment.
- The rest of our ordinance is fully enforceable right now.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I was asking you in terms of managing the workload of the Council, what are we going to do with this permitting issue?
- Are we giving up on it completely?
- We just voted, directed our Chief to write it up. Now we're tossing it up.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- If our direction to staff is to at least do some preliminary research on what an annual permit or a longer term permit, permanent type permit, that's up to us.
- That's for us to decide if that's the direction we want to give.
- I'm just proposing that that, it's up to us if that's something we want staff to look into.

Councilmember Gurney commented after the vote, Mr. Mayor, are you going to take us to that conversational point?

Mayor Slayter commented if that is what a Councilmember would like to do, we can address that.

Councilmember Gurney commented I would like, yes, I'm the Councilmember wanting us to be clear, for our public's sake, and for our staff, do we want this explored further or are we done with the whole permitting issue?

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Just to address in my opinion Councilmember Gurney's questions, as we heard in the staff report, we could not implement a permitting system until we get a staffing report or a budget to submit it.
- That's why I've provided the second on the motion to move forward tonight, and postpone further discussion at this time of a permit system.

Mayor Slayter commented that's why I was okay with it, because I knew it had a potential stop at the staffing and budget subcommittee level.

Councilmember Rich commented as follows:

- I'm hoping that we can move forward with the motion of -- so -- is there a need to address the question regarding potential future parking permit exploration?
- let's handle the motion and dispense with that, then we can more clearly discuss one thing at a time.
- Which is difficult when we're all in our own little boxes.
- Just to clarify, because our City manager, City attorney, did make a point here.
- My motion is regarding is for an amendment, it isn't to change the underlying ordinance.
- It's simply proposing an amendment.
- It's an introduction of the amendments to an already enacted, already in force ordinance.

Councilmember Rich moved and Vice Mayor Hinton seconded the motion to approve Waiving of First Reading and Introduction of Ordinance XXXX, An Ordinance of the City of Sebastopol Amending Chapter 10.76 Recreational Vehicle Parking Ordinance and Amending Chapter 10.36 of the Sebastopol Municipal Code as discussed and displayed on screen by the Police Chief.

Mayor Slayter called for a roll call vote. City staff conducted a roll call vote.

VOTE:

Ayes:	Councilmembers Gurney, Rich, Vice Mayor Hinton and Mayor Slayter
Noes:	Councilmember Glass
Absent:	None
Abstain:	None

City Council Action: Approved Waiving of First Reading and Introduction of Ordinance XXXX, An Ordinance of the City of Sebastopol Amending Chapter 10.76 Recreational Vehicle Parking Ordinance and Amending Chapter 10.36 of the Sebastopol Municipal Code to include permitted RV parking is desired; direct staff to return with information related to the Ad Hoc Committee's review of the City-wide staffing assessment, including costs, to properly manage and enforce permitted RV parking in residential zoned areas of the City at a future date; and formally amend Section 10.76.040 D, Section 10.76.050 B, and Chapter 10.36.050.

Minute Order Number: 2022-140
Ordinance Number: 1142

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- I think that we probably can't go through it tonight.
- However, I do think that something like an annual permit kind of scheme with the simplified short-term permit for visitors would at least address some of the unintended consequences of what I think are unintended negative consequences of this ordinance.
- I think it is something worth visiting.
- However, we don't have any data or information about what the cost would be.
- So I agree, we need to go through the staffing, the staffing assessment.
- We also need to go through the budget process.

- However, as we're looking at the staffing assessment, I think what the Chief has looked at is what it would cost to be permitting under the kind of scheme that we have been talking about the past couple of months.
- It would be interesting to know, under a more simplified scheme, what would that cost?
- And I think that's just putting more work on him.
- However, if we were to consider it, I think that would be the kind of thing we would want to consider.
- Something that would address the issue of people that have been long-time RV or trailer owners, that suddenly now are getting kind of kicked out of town.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- I want to say, it's important to note that we've heard from a number of people, in fact people who are even in the room right now, whom I will not name, who are not happy with their neighbors parking their RV in front of their house, because the big RV is blocking driveway access and visibility on their street and the travel pathways.
- So that is kind of a mixed bag. We have both sides of everything.
- I would say that the practical approach Vice Mayor Hinton has come up with, let's wait for the staffing assessment to inform us, for the budget committee to do its work.
- I think we need to roll around with some experience on this ordinance, to see if the unintended consequences that Councilmember Glass foresees actually happen.
- So as we wait for those two, the volume of work to be done, I think we'll have some idea of what happens, what we have to live with, what we might have to correct and if we have money to do it.
- I'm fine to put this on, what do you say, a six-month calendar, something like that.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- I think that is a logical point. I agree with what I'm hearing from my colleagues.
- I think it would also be interesting if any individual has significant or greater interest than maybe others, you can take it up yourself and do a little Internet sleuthing, and find out what other communities are doing.
- That is easy and doesn't take any direction at all.

Due to the lateness of the hour the City Council was not in consensus to move beyond the 10:30 pm ending time and continued items 14 through 19 to the next regular City Council Meeting of May 3, 2022.

REGULAR CALENDAR AGENDA ITEMS (DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION):

14. Consideration of Standard Conditions of Approval for Development Projects (Design Guideline Subcommittee/Planning Dept)

City Council Action: Item was continued to the City Council Meeting of May 3,2022.
Minute Order Number: 2022-142

15. Direction to Staff regarding Merger of the Zero Waste Committee into the Climate Action Committee (Requestor: Councilmember Gurney and Councilmember Rich/Responsible Department: Planning)

City Council Action: Item was continued to the City Council Meeting of May 3,2022.
Minute Order Number: 2022-143

16. Receive presentation and adopt Resolution approving the Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP) (City Engineer/GHD)

City Council Action: Item was continued to the City Council Meeting of May 3,2022.
Minute Order Number: 2022-144

17. Re-Introduction of Ordinance – Planning Commission (Responsible Department: Planning)
City Council Action: Item was continued to the City Council Meeting of May 3,2022.
Minute Order Number: 2022-145

18. Discussion of City Council Direction to City Staff for Either: In Person or Hybrid Meetings; and Approval of Resolution Authorizing Continued Use of Teleconference Meetings Based on Circumstances of the COVID-19 state of emergency and that the following circumstances exist:
    a. The state of emergency as a result of COVID-19 continues to directly impact the ability of the members of City Council and the members of the City's subordinate Committee's, Commission's, and Boards to meet safely in person; and
    b. The State of California and the City of Sebastopol continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing.

Resolution needs to be submitted to Council every 30 days. (Responsible Department: City Administration /Administrative Services)
City Council Action: Item was continued to the City Council Meeting of May 3,2022.
Minute Order Number: 2022-146

The following items were not discussed due to the lateness of the meeting.
CITY COUNCIL/CITY STAFF REPORTS/COMMUNICATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS/FUTURE MEETINGS:

19. City Manager-Attorney/City Clerk Reports
20. City Council Reports/Committee/Sub-Committee Meeting Reports: (Reports by Mayor/City Councilmembers Regarding Various Agency Meetings/Committee Meetings/Sub-Committee Meeting /Conferences Attended and Possible Direction to its Representatives (If Needed) on Pending issues before such Boards)
    (This will be either verbal or written reports provided at the meeting)
21. Council Communications Received
22. Future City Meeting Dates/Events (Informational Only): (See City Web Site for Up-to-Date Meeting Dates/Times)

ADJOURNMENT OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING:
Mayor Slayter adjourned the April 19, 2022 City Council meeting at 10:44 pm to April 20, 2022 City Council Special Meeting Closed Session, 9:30 am
April 20, 2022 City Council Special Meeting Closed Session will be adjourned to the May 3, 2022 City Council Meeting, 6:00 pm, Zoom Virtual Meeting Format

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary C. Gourley

Mary Gourley
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk